A

TREATISE

TENDING TO

MITIGATION

towardes Catholicke-Subiectes in England.

BODLEIANA

VVHERIN IS DECLARED,

That it is not impossible for Subiects of different Religion, (especially *Catholickes* and *Protestantes*) to liue togeather in dutifull obedience and subiection, vnder the gouernment of his Maiesty of *Great Britany*.

AGAINST

The seditious wrytings of THOMAS MORTON *Minister, & some others to the contrary.*

Whose two false and slaunderous groundes, pretended to be dravvne from Catholicke doctrine & practice, concerning REBELLION and EQVIVOCATION, are ouerthrowne, and cast vpon himselfe.

Dedicated to the learned Schoole-Deuines, Cyuill and Canon Lavvyers of the tvvo Vniuersities of England.

By P. R. Parsons

Prou. 26. Vers. 20.

Sussurrone subtracto, iurgia conquiescunt.
The make-bate being remoued, brawles do cease.

Permissu Superiorum. 1607.

h 438

THE SVMME OF ALL THAT IS HANDLED IN THIS TREATISE.

1. IN *the Preface and firſt ſix Chapters, is diſcuſſed all that belongeth to the firſt imputation about* Diſobedience *or* Rebellion, *either out of the* Catholicke *or* Proteſtant *doctrine, vſe, practice, or conſequence therof: with what is obiected, or anſwered on both partes.*

2. IN *the other 7. Chapters, is treated the Queſtion of* Equiuocation, *how it began, what origen, cauſes, vſe, or neceſsity it hath, or may haue; what circumſtances for lawfulnes, what reſtraintes, or limites: and finally, what practice among all ſortes of men in certaine caſes, euen with thoſe that moſt impugne the ſame.*

3. VPon *all which is inferred the principall concluſion; that theſe two pretended obſtacles do not let, but that* Catholicke *and* Proteſtant *English Subiectes may liue togeather in vnion of dutifull obedience vnder his Maieſty, to his, and their both ſafety and comfortes, if ſeditious make-bates be remoued.*

THE

THE EPISTLE DEDICATORY.

To the learned Schole-Deuines and Lawiers of both faculties in the Vniuersities of England.

IT was no part of my purpose (learned Countrey-men) when I tooke this Treatise first in hand, either to wade so farre therin, as now I haue byn compelled; or yet to prefix any other Epistle Dedicatory before the same, then the large common Preface it selfe that doth ensue, which may partly appeare by the argument therof, as namely also and principally, by that which we haue set downe in the third Chapter of this Treatise: for that taking in hand, but to point, as it were, at the exorbitant number of some monstrous, and malitious lyes, and slaunders cast abroad this last yeare in a certayne small contemptible, but wicked and hatefull libell, vnder the tytle of *A discouery of Romish doctrine in the case of Conspiracy and Rebellion by T. M.* I thought it sufficient to that purpose to shew not only the cankred vntruthes of those most false & virulent calumniations; but the many inõueniences also, and publicke hurtes, which do, and must needes ensue to any Common wealth, that suffereth such venemous tongues to sow hatred, dissention, diffidence, The Authors first intention.

and the seedes of perpetuall emnity and alienation among the Subiects therof.

2. Which point hauing to my iudgment sufficiently performed, I saw a farre greater booke published from the same Author stuffed with Marchandize of like marke, but yet imbracing more matter, to wit, not only the former argument, or inuectiue of heynous *Rebellion*; but (to vse the writers wordes) *of heathenish, hellish, and exetrable Equiuocation*, chargin Catholicke people so deeply and desperatly in them both, as that in these two respects, they are not only in his censure insociable, & intractable, but also insufferable in any Protestant common wealth: whervpon I was enforced as well to reassume againe that which before I had done and layd aside, vpon certayn causes which afterwards are vttered; as also to dilate my selfe much further, for defence of equity and truth, and for the repressing somwhat this violent rayling *Rabsaces*, and for rendering some euident reasons of Catholickes innocency and integrity in them both. Wherin what I haue performed for their iust and lawfull defence, I leaue it to the Iudgement of yow my learned Countrey-men, after yow shall haue read ouer this our Answere, presuming that your learning and vnderstanding is accõpanyed also with such ingenuity of good nature, and maturity of Iudgement, as yow will not be carryed away with the wynd, and sound of wordes only as others of lesser capacity; nor yet be much moued with the false outcryes of perfidious Make-bates, who inraged with the imaginations of hate and auersion, do like furious houndes runne-counter vpon euery false sent they apprehend, or frame vnto themselues; but rather will stand firme, and weigh the substance, and proofes of matters with their due circumstances. Which if yow performe, yow shall fynd all these odious and clamorous accusations, and exaggerations

4. Reg. 18. Esay. 36.

Difference of hearers.

gerations of this fyerie Miniſter to be nothing els, but euaporations of a hoate diſtempered brayne with aboundance of hatred and want of Chriſtian charity.

3. And to ſay a word or two of the reaſons that moued me to preſent this worke to yow the learned of our Engliſh Vniuerſities in the foreſayd ſciences of Schoole-Deuinity and Lawe, both Canon & Ciuill, wherof the firſt is, that the queſtion of *Equiuocation* (wherof our chiefe contention is) being a matter handled in theſe three facultyes, (though vpon different occaſions) yow can far better iudge therof then others, who apprehending only the name togeather with their owne conceipts therof without true knowledge of the groundes, reaſons & circumſtances wherby it is made lawfull, doe not ſo eagerly, as ignorantly, cry out againſt it, condemning & deteſting that which they vnderſtand not, as largly is declared in the 7. Chapter of the enſuing Treatiſe, which is the firſt concerning that argument. But ſuch as are more conuerſant and better ſtudied in the ſaid ſciences, and know the true principles wheron the queſtion ſtandeth, are not ſo raſh nor headlong, but goe more reſeruedly therin, diſtinguiſhing betweene lawfull and vnlawfull, *Amphybologie* or *Equiuocation*, aſsigning to each one their tymes, caſes, cauſes, reſeruations and limitations, according to the obſeruation of *Ariſtotle: Prudentis eſt diſtinguere*; It appertayneth to a wiſe and diſcreet man to diſtinguiſh; wheras the ignorant and vnlearned doth commonly confound all without diſtinction. 1. Reaſons of the dedication.

4. My ſecond reaſon was, for that forreine Vniuerſities, and learned men therof, vnderſtanding ſuch a booke to haue byn ſet forth by an Engliſh Vniuerſity man, *and not without direction* (as he ſaith) *from his Superiors*, wherin all vſe of *Equiuocation* or *Amphybology* in any caſe whatſoeuer is condemned as vnlawfull, *im-* 2.

piouſ, execrable, hellish, heatherish, the black-art, and other ſuch tearmes, without reſpect or regard, that in all other Vniuerſityes in Catholicke Coūtreyes throughout the world, in all Courtes and Tribunalls, and in all learned Authors & profeſſors of the foreſaid three faculties, for many ages, ſome vſe therof hath byn taught and allowed: diuers learned (I ſay) haue wondred therat and laughed alſo, eſpecially being aduertiſed that this doctrine of *Equiuocation* is aſcribed, as a new thing to the Ieſuits, wheras many ages before their name was heard of in the world this doctrine was known, taught, and held. Wherfore theſe ſtrangers are wont to demaund, whether there be any learned men indeed in theſe three facultyes now in our Vniuerſities, and whether any be ſtudyed in Schoole-Deuinity and the Lawes, either Ciuill or Canon; for if there be, it ſeemes impoſsible to them that ſuch a booke ſhould be ſuffered to come forth ſo full of ignorance as this is. For (ſay they) if they had read or looked ouer but theſe heads in the ſaid ſciences, to wit, *of the nature of truth and lyinge*, of the lawfullnes of diſſimulation in certaine caſes both in wordes & works, as namely, in ſtratagemes of war, of the lawfulnes of couering ſome truth vpon iuſt occaſion in the Canon law out of *S. Auguſtine*, of *Dolus malus* and *Dolus bonus* or *vtilis* in the ſame law out of *S. Hierome*, and other Fathers; of the caſes wherin a man may ſweare, or not ſweare lawfully, or not be bound to keep his oath; of the queſtion whether God can deceiue, or any man elſe by his ſpirit, of the limitations of an accuſer and defendant; of the obligation of a witnes to vtter, deny or diſſemble the truth; of the office of a Iudge, Aduocate, or Solicitour in accuſation or defence of any body; of the caſes wherin ſecreſy is neceſſarily to be obſerued by all lawfull meanes, both in & out of confeſsion, and diuers other ſuch like heades of doctrine,

Sundry heades vvherin Equiuocation is touched both in Lavv and Deuinity.

as

as occurre daylie in all the foreſaid three faculties, and in the common vſe of mans life; theſe learned men affirme, that it is impoſsible for our Vniuerſity-Doctors to haue read and weighed them, but they muſt confeſſe the lawfulnes of *Equiuocation* in diuers caſes, and that it may be without lying (which is lawfull in no caſe, nor for any cauſe whatſoeuer.) Wherof they inferre that either their ſciences are not ſtudyed in our Vniuerſites, or that the ſtudents profit little in them, or that the worſt learned of all are ſuffered to write bookes: which thing for that it appertayneth to the diſgrace of your ſo famous Schooles; I thought it one ſufficiēt cauſe amongſt the reſt, to dedicate this Anſwere vnto yow.

5. My third reaſon was to moue yow by this occaſion, to conſider more attentiuely what manner of men they be for the moſt part, that write in England at this day; how ſhallow in the matters they take vpō them to make bookes of; but eſpecially to wiſh yow, that when any booke commeth forth, yow would but examine the truth of the citations which are alleadged by them, for this only would be ſufficient to informe and ſatisfie yow where the truth is. And ſo I deſire no more but your attention in this one point, for the deciſion of the controuerſie betweene me and *Thomas Morton*: for if yow find him to haue dealt ſincerly in alleaging his Authors, I am content he haue the victory, though he haue behaued himſelf otherwiſe neuer ſo weakly. For triall of which point, I remit my ſelf to that, which I haue handled afterward more plentifully and perticularly in the 2. 6. and 12. Chapters of purpoſe. 3.

6. But yet for that ſince the writing of the enſuing Preface, I haue read and pervſed two Epiſtles of his laſt booke intituled, *A full ſatisfaction*, the one to the Kings Maieſty, the other to the ſeduced brethren, as

ſcorn-

ſcornfully he calleth the Catholickes, which Epiſtles haue as much gaule in them as the mans diſpitefull ſtomake could vtter, I ſhall pray yow to haue patience with me, if I runne ouer briefly certaine notes out of the ſaid Epiſtles, wherby yow may partly take notice of the mans talent in writing, but eſpecially in raylinge, vntill yow come vnto a more full view therof in the ſequele of this our Anſwere that doth enſue.

7. Thus then he beginneth with his Maieſty within ſome halfe doſen lines after the entrance of his Epiſtle. *Innocency*, (ſaith he) *which though naked was neuer ashamed, hath charged me to manifeſt my ſelf vnto your Highnes, and togeather with my Aduerſarye to appeale vnto your incõparable wiſdome, which I doe in ſo conſtant aſſurance of an vpright cõſcience as that I ſhal willingly remit that iuſt aduantage, which the difference of compariſon both betweene a legitimate or conformable ſubiect, and a perſon ſuſpiciouſly degenerate, alſo betweene a Miniſter of ſimple truth, and a profeſſed Equiuocator doth offer vnto me.* Heere yow ſee him vaunt of ſundry points; as firſt of his *naked innocency*, which we haue afterwards to his greater ſhame, ſo cloathed with the foule ragges of his lying and moſt deceiptfull dealing, as ſhe may no more be called *a naked*, but rather a clouted innocency, if innocency at all, and not rather malicious nocencie, intending to wound and iniury the iuſt, and ſuch as are faultles and innocent in deed.

T M his appeale to his Maieſty. *Epiſt. 1. initio.*

2. 8 Secondly he appealeth to his Maieſtyes *incõparable wiſdome*, as yow ſee, *in the conſtant aſſurance of an vpright conſcience*; but we haue ſhewed throughout this whole worke, that nothing is further of from this fellow, then any conſcience at all: for that we haue taken him in ſo many wilfull falſifications and corruptions (wherin he could not but know that he did lye and falſify;) as beſides all other examples layd forth in ſundry ſeuerall partes of this Anſwere, I haue byn

forced

forced to make a ſpeciall Chapter therof, which is the ſixt of this enſuring worke, where as alſo in the 4. Paragraph of the 2. Chapter and els where, the Reader ſhall fynd ſuch ſtore of teſtimonyes againſt the vprightnes of this mans conſcience, as I dare aſſure my ſelfe, he will leeſe, with indifferent men, *the conſtant aſſurance* of honeſty, howſoeuer in his owne opinion he may hold the ſame aſſurance for other matters.

9. Thirdly he ſaith to his Maieſty *he doth willingly remit that iuſt aduantage which the difference of a legitimate and conformable ſubiect, and a perſon ſuſpiciouſly degenerate doth offer vnto him:* wherin what he would ſay I do rather gheſſe by diſcourſe, then vnderſtand by the ſenſe of his wordes. For I imagine that the Miniſter would ſay, that he is ready and preſt to conforme himſelfe to any thing, that the State or Prince ſhall appoint him, as well in Religion, as in other matters whatſoeuer, and that therin cõſiſteth his vprightnes of conſcience, to wit, to be conformable. And for that his aduerſary ſhewing himſelfe (perhaps) more ſcrupulous and timerous in certayne pointes concerning his ſoule or conſcience, and not ſo conformable: therfore he calleth him *ſuſpiciouſly degenerate, and no legitimate, and conformable ſubiect*, which whither it tendeth, and towardes what gate of Atheiſme, or Herodianiſme, euery man that hath Iudgement and conſcience in deed will eaſily diſcerne. 3. The conformity of T. M.

10. But of all the reſt, the fourth point is the moſt ridiculous, wherin he intituleth himſelfe, *A miniſter of ſimple truth*, and his aduerſary *A profeſſed Equiuocator*, wheras I haue ſhewed in the 7. and 12. Chapters of this Anſwere, firſt, that ſuch as grant the lawfulnes of *Equiuocation* in ſome limited caſes, are farre more ſeuere & rigorous againſt al kynd of lying in the leaſt things that may be (as appeareth by their knowne, and con- 4.

 feſſed

feſſed doctrine by vs ſet downe,) then are their aduerſaryes in the greateſt; yea higheſt kind or degree of that ſinne, I meane of lying: and in the ſecond, beſides the multiplicy of conuictions, wherby I haue made demonſtration of this mans falſity euery where, I haue ſhewed in the foreſaid 12. Chapter, that he (*this Miniſter* to wit *of ſimple truth*) as alſo his fellowes which profeſſe themſelues ſuch enemyes of lawfull Equiuocation that may be vſed without lying, do Equiuocate euery where in the worſt & moſt ſinfull ſort of flat lying that may be imagined, without any reſeruation or veile, or ſubſtance of truth at all. For proofe wherof I referre me to the ſaid 12. Chapter, and ſhall returne to follow this fellow ſomwhat further in the ſaid Epiſtle to his Maieſty.

A Miniſter of ſimple truth.

11. For not many lynes after the former paſſage, by occaſion of certayne wordes of him that firſt anſwered him about a march of apes; he taketh vpon him to ſet forth a certayne march of Soldiers cõming againſt his Maieſty and other Proteſtant Princes from the 7. hills of Babilon, to wit Rome, ſaying thus: May it pleaſe your ſacred Maieſty, to ſee how exactly they imitate Souldiers in their march? *Parſons*, teaching perſecution againſt all Kings and States Proteſtant, doth propound for his imitation the example of *Dauid* in his conflict againſt *Goliah*: *Allen*, the example of *Eliah* in calling, if it were poſsible, for fyre from heauen to conſume the Meſſengers of Kings: *Reynolds* the example of *Iabel* to knock *Generals* on the head: *Bellarmine* the example of *Iehoida*, and other Prieſtes for murthering of oppoſite Queenes: *Sanders*, the example of *Mattathias*, who fought againſt King *Antiochus*: *Simancha* the example of *Heathenish Scythians*, who murthered their naturall King *Scyles*: *Boucher* the example of *Sampſon*, to kill, if they can, a thouſand of his ſuppoſed *Philiſthians* with the iaw-bone of an Aſſe.

Epiſtle to the King.

A fayned march againſt his Maieſty.

12. So he. And doth not the man deſerue to haue a iawe-bone of an Aſſe for his dinner, that hath ſo laboured to lay togeather theſe impertinent examples, without head or foote, ground or proofe, purpoſe or coherence, truth or ſimilitude with the matter in hand? For where doth he fynd theſe marchinges againſt his Maieſty? why had not he cyted ſome place or teſtimony wherby might appeare this to be true that he obiecteth heere to theſe mẽ againſt his Highnes? Nay if his Maieſty will remember marchinges againſt him indeed, not imaginations in the ayre as theſe are, he will conſider what manner of men they haue byn, either Proteſtants or Catholickes that haue marched and machinated againſt him and his, for more then 40. yeares togeather, while he was in *Scotland*; what royall bloud was ſhed of his neereſt and deareſt in kynred; what violence vſed and practiſed vpon his owne perſon, and parents; who were the Authors, incenſers, fyre-brands, & bellowes of theſe enraged flames; Prieſts or Miniſters; thoſe that came from the hills of *Rome*, or ſuch as had their ſpirite from the valley of *Geneua*: and then if we would frame a ſquadron of all thoſe turbulent & lawleſſe Proteſtant people, that vexed and afflicted his Maieſty in *Scotland*, and marched againſt him, and his noble Mother, and grand Mother with banners diſplayed: and that we ſhould place before theſe againe, a Vanguard of preaching-Scottiſh-Miniſters, as *Knox*, and all his rablement, exhorting, incyting & ſounding out the trumpets of theſe rebellions; and a Rereward againe of Engliſh-Miniſters ſtanding behind them, and clapping their handes to their encouragemẽt, writing bookes and ſending them all ayde both in words and workes that poſsibly they could procure; whileſt in the meane ſpace both Catholicke prieſts & people in *England*, *Rome*, and els where, prayed hartely for the good

A true march againſt his Maieſty.

Vãguard

Rereward

ſucceſſe of his Maieſties ſaid parents, and for his in theirs: this (I ſay) was a true and reall march in deed, & that other imaginary, which our Miniſter to make vs odious hath heere deuiſed.

13. And to ſpeake one word more of this matter, for that it is of much importance, and the truth therof notorious to the world: When vpon the yeare of Chriſt 1586. fourteene principall and zealous yong gentle-men were moſt pittifully put to death in *London*, and diuers others condemned, and their goods confiſcated for an imputation, that they would haue deliuered his Maieſtyes mother out of priſon, and ſauoured her ſucceſsion to the Crowne; did not our raging Miniſters then, no leſſe fyerie then *MORTON* now, raue out of euery pulpit, not ſo much againſt them, as againſte the cauſe and obiectes of their calamity, which was the loue they bare both to mother and ſonne in that behalfe? Againſt whome alſo they neuer ceaſed to crye vntill they had gotten the life of the one to be taken away, and the Statute of *Aſſociation* to be made for endangering the other.

Catholicke Gentlemen ſuffering for his Maieſties title.

14. And when before that againe, vpon the yeare 1581. fourteene learned prieſts and Ieſuites, were arraigned & condemned vpon pretence that their comming into England was for ſome deſignement againſt the State; was not the greateſt, and moſt odious part of their arraignment (and moſt amplyfied by the Attorney *Popham* at that time) for that they were deuout to the Queene of *Scotland*, and her tytle, and prayed for her in their Maſſes, Letanies, and other prayers? Yea when ſome of them came to dye at *Tyborne*, and prayed at their death for the Queene of *England*, did not ſome principall men demaund them publikly from among the people, what Queene they meant, *Elizabeth*, or *Mary*? And was not this an ordinary *Equiuocation*, which Miniſters cryed out that Catholickes then vſed, and

Prieſts accuſed for their deuotion to the title of Scotland.

eſpe-

eſpecially prieſts? And how then doth this fond, and malicious Miniſter bring in ſuch Marchinges of Catholicke Soldiers againſt his Maieſty, who euer were for him? How doth he talke of ſuch kylling of *ſuppoſed Philiſthines* by the iaw-bone of an aſſe? The aſſe in deed we haue found, but the iaw-bone as yet we ſee not.

15. But let vs heare him go forward in vaunting to his Maieſty of his goodly workes. After the reply is finiſhed (ſaith he) there is preſented to your Princely, and moſt religious iudgement, *A confutation* of the reaſons of two of their more then vnreaſonable poſitiõs; as namely of *haynous Rebellions, and execrable Equiuocations*: both which are refelled (I hope) ſufficiently by the teſtimonyes of their owne moſt principall Doctors; *A courſe which I profeſſe in all diſputes*; knowing that by no better wiſdome may this new *Babylon* be confounded, then wherwith God wrought the deſtruction of the old, euen * *The diuiſion of their tongues*. So he. * Gen. 11. 7. & 9.

16. And yow muſt know, that this diuiſion of our tongues is nothing els but that he alleageth ſome tymes different opinions out of ſome of our Schoole-Doctors (which our men do for him, he hauing nothing heerin of his owne induſtry) in matters that be diſputable, and not determined by the Church. And is not this a great point, for ſo great a Rabbyn to bragge of, *as of a courſe which he profeſſeth in all his diſputes*? How doth fooliſh vanity diſcouer it ſelfe in all theſe mens wordes & actions? And yet let the Reader note attentiuely that notwithſtanding this bragge, he hath no one Catholicke Author in all this controuerſy about *Equiuocation*, that abſolutly denyeth the thing, or holdeth it for vnlawfull in all pointes as he doth, albeit ſome do differ in opinion concerning the caſes, cauſes, tymes, meanes, maners, limitations, and circumſtances of the ſame, as after is largely by vs declared. So as heere he hath no diuiſion of our tongues,

The vanity of T. M in denidinge our tongues.

but which himſelfe maketh, to wit, where ſomtymes to ſeeme to finde a difference where none is, he belyeth our Authors flatly, and forceth them to ſpeake one againſt an other, as in many places we do demonſtrate and leaue him with the ſhame.

17. Wherfore to ſay as he doth that our *execrable Equiuocations* are ſufficiently refelled by him with the teſtimonyes of our *moſt principall Doctors* is as true, as that *he is a Miniſter of ſimple truth, and naked innocency, and of conſtant aſſurance of an vpright conſcience*: all which are ridiculous *antiphraſes* in deed, for he hath no one Doctor of ours, either *moſt or leaſt principall* with him in his opinion, or that calleth *Equiuocations*, vſed with due circumſtances or limitations, *execrable*, or *vnlawfull*, or not neceſſary in ſome caſes; nor hath he any one ſentence, or teſtimony of theirs to the contrary, as after is made euident. And conſequently *this courſe of Tho. Morton in all his diſputes*, is a lying courſe, a vaunting courſe, a ridiculous courſe. And as for his *diſputes*, I do ſhew him after to be ſo ſylly a diſputer, as that he knoweth not how to make a true *ſyllogiſme*, and therfore am forced to ſend him backe againe to *Cambridge* to reforme his Logicke, or to learne more: about which point I remit the Reader to that which is handled in the 11. Chapter and els where of this Treatiſe.

A fond vaunt of T. M. refuted.

18. Next after this he layeth before his Maieſty a certayne obſeruatiõ about Popes names, as ful fraught with malice, and deceiptfulnes, as the former with vanity; and he layeth the obſeruation vpon *Polydor Virgil*, though cyting no place for it. *Polydore obſerueth* (ſaith he) *that the Popes a long tyme in their election had their names changed by Antiphraſis, videl. the Elected, if he were by naturall diſpoſition feareſull, was named Leo, if cruell*, Clemẽt, *if vnciuill*, Vrbanus, *if wicked*, Pius; *if couetous*, Bonifacius; *if in all behauiour intollerable*, Innocentius: And with this he thinketh to haue layd downe an obſeruation-

Epiſt. ad Regem.

of

of importance. But why had he not adioyned alſo, that if he were careles of his flocke, then *Gregory* muſt be his name, which importeth a vigilant paſtor?

19. But now let the iudicious Reader obſerue the malice, and falſhood of this obſeruation, and therby iudge, whether the Author therof be a *Miniſter of ſimple truth* or no. *Polydore* ſaith only that ſometymes Popes, as other Princes in like manner, haue had names, that haue byn different, or rather contrary to their nature & manners, which is an ordinary caſe if we examine the ſignification of men and womens names; but that Popes names were changed of purpoſe by *Antiphraſis*, or contrary ſpeach to couer their defectes, as heere is ſet downe, this is a malicious lye of the Miniſter, and hath neither *ſimplicyty*, nor *truth* in it, for that all theſe names heere mentioned of *Leo*, *Clemens*, *Vrbanus*, *Pius*, *Bonifacius*, *Innocentius*, *and Gregory*, were choſen by the Popes that tooke them for the great reuerence, and eſtimation they had of certayne excellent men of that name that went before them; as alſo for the good abodement of their future gouernment, and to be ſtyrred vp the more by the memory of thoſe names to the vertues ſignified by them; but eſpecially for the honor and imitation of the firſt Popes that bare thoſe names. As for example of *S. Leo* the firſt, who how excellent a man he was, both for learning and ſanctity, appeareth by the acknowledgment of the Proteſtants themſelues. *M. Iewell* making this Apoſtrophe vnto him in his chalenge, *O Leo, O Peter, O Paul, O Chriſt!*

A falſe and malitious obſeruation of T. M. againſt Popes refuted.

20. The like may be ſaid of *S. Clement* the firſt and next Pope after *S. Peter*; and the ſame of *S. Vrbanus* Pope and Martyr, in the ſecond age after the Apoſtles: and the like of *Pius* the firſt Pope and Martyr, in the firſt age after the ſaid Apoſtles; and no leſſe of *S. Bonifacius* the firſt that liued in the beginning of the fourth age, and a little before him againe in the ſame

age

age S. *Innocentius* the firſt, ſo highly commended by S. *Auguſtine* for a great Saint: and after him againe S. *Gregory* the Great, and firſt Pope of that name moſt admirable both to thoſe of his time and all poſterity for many excellent vertues, who though lyuing ſome ages after all the former; yet haue there byn 13. Popes after him, that for reuerence of his vertues haue taken his name, and ten of S. *Leo*, 7. of S. *Clement*, 6. of S. *Vrbanus*, 4. of S. *Pius*, 7. of S. *Bonifacius*, and 8. of S. *Innocentius*, wherof none had that name by baptiſme, but all by choiſe after they were elected Popes, for the cauſes now touched. Which being ſo, it is euident what a wicked loſt conſcience this Miniſter hath, to auouch vnto a King, and by him to all others, ſo manifeſt, and malitious a calumniation.

21. But he goeth further yet in folly to magnify his owne learning and to compare the ſame with no leſſe then *Ariſtotle*. *I haue ſo framed this diſpute* (ſaith he) *that it may ſeeme, I hope, to be like* Ariſtotles *bookes of naturall Philoſophy, ſo published, as not published, &c.* And his reaſon is. *For that* as he ſaith, *he alwayes putteth downe the clauſe of mentall reſeruation in Latin*: which yet is not true, as the Reader wil ſee by perʋſing this booke, he hauing to my remembrance ſet downe the ſame in Latyn but once only throughout all his booke, and that in fower words in his ſecond page, the ſaid reſeruation being mentioned in Engliſh, more perhaps then forty tymes, nor were it of any importance if it were alwayes put downe in Latyn. For that any man lightly whether he vnderſtand Latyn, or no, if he ſee or heare the precedence both of queſtion and anſwere, will eaſily gheſſe what the reſeruation is, if he ſuſpect any to be at all, as if a man doe heare or reade the premiſſes of a ſyllogiſme in Engliſh, he will eaſely gheſſe at the concluſion, though it be in Latin; yea if he be of any meane capacity, he will gather the inference himſelfe by

by naturall diſcourſe. Wherfore this of *Ariſtotles* books was brought in only by the vayne Miniſter to compare them with his bookes, *or*, as he calleth them, *his diſputes, ſo published* (forſooth) *as not published*, for that he imagineth that the common capacity of men cannot reach vnto the depth therof, he wadeth ſo profoundly in his owne folly. But yow will ſee afterwardes that he is vnderſtood, and ſo decyphered, as he may be vnderſtood, and pitted alſo by others. And I know no ſenſe wherin he may ſay, that his workes are *ſo publiſhed, as not published*, but that they are not worthy indeed the publiſhing and much leſſe the readinge, wherin they doe differ much from thoſe of *Ariſtotle*.

Hovv T. M. his bookes are ſo publiſhed as not published.

22. It followeth in his ſaid Epiſtle to his Maieſty: *For that this doctrine of Equiuocation* (ſaith he) *acknowledged by your admirable wiſdome to be in religion moſt ſacrilegious and deteſtable, in politike State moſt pernicious and intollerable, and in euery actor moſt banefull to the ſoule of man; it may pleaſe your Excellent Maieſty to prouide in this behalfe for your faithfull and religious Subiectes, that they neuer be ſo intoxicated with this Antichriſtian ſpirite, as either to deceyue, or be deceyued therby, &c.* Would God it might pleaſe his Highnes *in his admirable wiſedome* to pervſe ouer but two, or three Chapters of this Treatiſe about *Equiuocation*, and the reaſons of the lawfulnes and neceſsity therof in ſome caſes, togeather with the groſſe, monſtrous, ſacrilegious, and deteſtable licence of lying, taken vp, and vied by the impugners of lawfull *Equiuocation*, and eſpecially Miniſters, that moſt talke, and make profeſsion of *ſimple truth*; I do not doubt, but his Excellent Maieſty out of his Chriſtian piety would prouide in this behalfe, for his faithfull and religious Subiectes *that they ſhould not be ſo much deceyued by them, as they are, nor intoxicated with their Antichriſtiã lying ſpirite*, to their eternal perditiõ. And this is ſo much as I haue thought good to reply in this place cõcerning his Epiſtle to his Maieſty.

Epiſtle to the King againſt Equiuocation.

T. M. his idle Epiſtle to the deceaued brethren.

23. As for the other which ſcornfully he directeth *to the deceyued brethren*, it is ſo ſhort, fond & ydle a thing, that it deſerueth no anſwere at all, the principall point, whervpon he ſtandeth therin, being this, that Catholicke people are ſeduced by their prieſtes, *who will be Doctors* (ſaith he *out of S. Paul to Timothy*) *and yet vnderſtand not what they ſay, nor vpherof they affirme.* But whether this deſcription of fond preſumptuous Doctors touched by *S. Paul* do agree rather to Proteſtant-Miniſters, or to Catholicke prieſtes, will appeare in great part by reading ouer this booke, eſpecially the 5. 8. and 10. Chapters, if by *Thomas Mortons* errors and ignorances, a ſcantling may be taken of the reſt. But now let vs ſee how he doth go about to proue that our prieſts are ſuch bad Doctors, as *S. Paul* ſpeaketh of.

1. Tim. 2.

24. His chiefe proofe conſiſteth in a certayne comparing of them with thoſe Iewiſh prieſtes of the old law in Chriſtes tyme, who taught the ſouldiers that watched at the *Sepulcher* of our Sauiour, to ſay, that whileſt they were ſleeping, his diſciples came & ſtole him away; *Common ſenſe* (ſaith he) *might haue replyed, how could yow tell, what was done, when yow were all a ſleepe? But myndes enthralled in the opinion of a neuer-erring prieſthood (which confirmed that anſwere) could not poſsibly but erre with their prieſtes; ſuch (alas) is the caſe of all them, &c.* Do yow ſee how ſubſtantially he hath proued this matter? Let vs examine the particulers: firſt the ſtory, then the inference.

25. About the ſtory, *S. Mathew* recounteth in the 28. chapter of his Ghoſpell, how Chriſt our Sauiour being rayſed miraculouſly from death to lyfe, with a great and dreadfull earthquake, and diſcent of an Angels, ſo as the ſouldiers that kept the ſepulcher were aſtoniſhed, and almoſt dead for feare, ſome of them ranne and told the chiefe prieſts therof, who making a conſultation with the Elders, deuiſed this ſhift to

giue

giue them ſtore of money and to bid them ſay, that in the night when they were a ſleepe his diſciples came and ſtole him away, and ſo they did. And *S. Mathew* addeth, that this falſe brute ranne currant among the Iewes, euen vntill that tyme, wherin he wrote his Ghoſpell. This is the narration, what hath now *Thom. Morton* to ſay to this againſt vs, for therunto is all his dryfte. Firſt he ſaith as yow haue heard that this deuiſe was improbable, and againſt common ſenſe it ſelfe. *Common ſenſe* (ſaith he) *might haue replyed* (to the ſouldiers) *what could yow tell what was done when yow were all a ſleepe?* Se heere the ſharpenes of *Tho. Mortons* wit, aboue that of the Prieſts, Scribes, and Phariſies. But what if one of the ſouldiers had replyed to him thus: *VVe ſaw it not, when we were a ſleepe, but afterward when we were awakened, we perceyued that he was ſtolne away.* What reioynder would our miniſter make? As for example if *Tho. Morton* were walking with a cõmunion-booke vnder his arme through a feild, and wearyed ſhould ly downe to ſleepe with his booke by his ſyde, and at his awaking ſhould ſee his booke gone, were it againſt cõmon ſenſe for him to ſay, that his booke was ſtolne from him while he was a ſleepe? Or is not this an aſſertion fit for one of thoſe Doctors wherof *S. Paul* talketh, that vnderſtand not what they ſay, or wherof they affirme. But this will better yet appeare by the ſecond point which is his inference. Wherfore we muſt a litle alſo examine that.

The difficulty of T. M. how men may knowv vvhat is done vvl they are a ſleepe reſolued.

26. *But myndes* (ſaith he) *enthralled in the opinion of a neuer-erring prieſthood (which confirmed that anſwere) could not poßibly but erre with their prieſtes, ſuch (alas) is the caſe of all them, &c.* The malitious man would deface Chriſtian prieſthood by the Iewiſh prieſthood, and our Prieſts by theirs: but conſider how farre he runneth from the marke in both: *myndes enthralled* (ſaith he) *in the opinion of a neuer-erring prieſthood, which confirmed this anſwere:*

Did the Prieſt-hood of *Iury* confirme this Anſwere? Who ſaith ſo? We read that the Prieſts with the Elders did deuiſe this anſwer, and they knew they did euill, and lye therin, and ſo did the ſouldiers alſo that publiſhed the ſame. But this was a matter of fact, not a determination of faith. Neyther among the Iewes nor Chriſtians was there euer opinion that Prieſts, or Prieſthood could not erre in matters of fact, lyfe, or their maners. How then is this to the purpoſe? Or doth not this alſo proue him to be one of thoſe forenamed Doctors, that vnderſtand not what they ſay, or wherof they affirme? How much more modeſty and piety had it byn in *Thom. Morton* to haue followed the example of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, who though perſecuted by thoſe Prieſts; yet both thought and ſpake reuerently of the Prieſthood.

27. *S. Iohn* the Euangeliſt ſetting downe the ſpeach of wicked *Cayphas* the High-Prieſt about the death of Chriſt, to wit, *that it was neceſſary for one to dye for the people*; addeth preſently: *that Cayphas ſpake not this of himſelfe, but propheſyed as being High-Prieſt of that yeare.* S. Paul in like manner being apprehended, and brought into a Counſell of the Iewes, and vniuſtly ſtroken on the face by the commaundement of wicked *Ananias* the High-Prieſt, whome therupon in his anger he called *Paynted-wall*, as ſoone as euer he was warned that he was the High-Prieſt, he excuſed himſelfe, that he knew it not. *I did not know brethren* (ſaith he) *that he was Chiefe-Prieſt for it is writen, thou ſhalt not ſpeake euill of the Prince of thy people* And when the ſaid Apoſtle doth afterwards handle in his Epiſtle to the *Hebrewes* this Iewiſh Prieſthood, as a figure of that of Chriſt our Sauiour, and of the new Teſtament, he ſpeaketh very honorably therof, ſaying: *That euery Chief-Prieſt taken out from men, is appointed for men in thoſe things that belong to to God, to offer giftes, and ſacrifices for ſynnes, &c.* But Chriſt him-

Iohn. 11.

Prieſthood of the old Teſtamẽt derided by T. M. greatly honored by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Act. 23.

Heb. 7.

himselfe most honorably of all other gaue to his disciples, and to the people this aduertisement: *Vpon the Chayre of Moyses haue sitten Scribes and Pharisies; all things therfore whatsoeuer they shall say vnto yow, obserue, and do them, but do not according to their workes.*

28. And if vnto the ancient *Aaronicall* Priest-hood of the old Testament, so much honour, so much credit, so much obedience was to be performed (which yet was not so sanctifyed by the diuine person of *Christ* himselfe, nor yet so adorned with the promise of his infallible assistance, as ours of the new Testament is, according to the Order of *Melchisedech*) what impiety is this in *Thomas Morton* to go about to discredit the one by the other? yea to ascribe the lying of the Iewish souldyers and their talking against common sense (as he will haue it) vnto their enthralled opinion of *a neuer-erring Priest-hood*? Is not this senseles? Had these souldyers an opinion perhaps that their Priests could not sinne? Or did they hold this for a point of doctrine, determined vnto them out of *Moyses* chayre? Or if te y did not, how is this their fact attributed by *Thomas Morton* vnto *that enthralled opinion of theirs*?

29. But he goeth further yet, and ascribeth all our errors amongst Catholickes vnto the same enthralled opinion of *a neuer-erring Priest-hood*: for holding whereof he saith, *that God in his iustice hath deliuered vs vp to beleeue lyes and dreames, and yet he is for examples the deliuery of Traians soule out of the lowest hell. The donation of Constantine; the bodily assumption of our Lady; the harbouringe of a louse by S. Francis; the new miracles of Christians amongst the Indians &c.* But heere now *Thomas Morton*, if he would shew himself a man *of common sense* and iudgment indeed, & to deale really and not by calumniatio, should proue three thinges. First that all these positions are held by vs as he setteth them downe: Secondly that they are all false indeed as we hold them: and thirdly, that

1 Thes. 2.

False calumniations.

therfore we erre in them, for that we belieue our Prieſt-hood cannot erre; ſo as the cauſality of theſe errors muſt fall vpon the enthralled opinion *of our neuer-erring Prieſt-hood.*

30. Of which three pointes he proueth neuer a one, nor goeth about to proue it: and we deny them all in the ſenſe that he obiecteth them: For as for *Traians* ſoule, no learned Catholicke man doth hold it, either for true or likly: and it is at large refuted by *Baronius* a Catholicke writer. *Conſtantines* donation is a matter of ſtory diſputed to and fro by learned men of our religion. The aſſumption of our B. *Lady* hath more groundes for it, then either *Morton* or a thouſand *Mortons* will be able to impugne, for that he can not deny, but that for many ages togeather it hath byn receaued through out all Chriſtendome for an ancient tradition, and from the time of the moſt learned *S. Iohn Damaſcene*, (that liued in the Eaſt Church, almoſt nine hundred yeares gone, and expreſly recordeth the ſaid tradition to be held for ancient in his time) T. M. muſt needes graunt the ſame; and then how many thouſandes of more learned, godly, vigilant, and prudent Chriſtian men then *Morton* is, haue belieued the ſame in ſo many worldes throughout all Chriſtendome, as namely *S. Bernard* and others, euery man may eaſily ſee, as alſo conſider this one reaſon amongſt the reſt; that if the ſacred body of that Bleſſed Virgin, Mother of God, had byn left any where vpon earth, as other Saintes bodyes were, ther would haue remayned at leaſt ſome memory, ſome teſtimony therof, or ſome deuotion to the place.

Baron. tom. 2. anno 100. ſub finem & in tom. 8. anno. 604. fuſe.

The defence of the bodily aſſumptiõ of the B. virgin.

See S. Bernard in his 5. Sermons of the Aſſumption of our B. Lady & alibi.

31. And for ſo much as by Gods holy prouidence ſo great concourſe hath byn made euer vnto the bodyes of *S. Peter, S. Paul*, and other of the Apoſtles, Martyres and Saintes of God, in different places, though neuer ſo remote, it is more then probable, that ſome would

haue

haue byn made likewiſe vnto this ſacred body of our Bleſſed Lady: but the malice of theſe people is ſuch to the holy memory of this bleſſed virgin vpon earth, and their precipitation to vnbeliefe ſo haſty and inconſiderate, as whatſoeuer they ſee not with their eyes, they deny as abſolutly falſe. For what certainty can *T. M.* haue (thinke yow) againſt the bodily Aſſumption of our Bleſſed Lady, his aſſertion being a bare negatiue? What certainty againſt the miracles wrought by God in the *Indies*? Is the hand of God ſhortened? Is not Chriſt as powerfull now, as he was in the Primitiue Church, *when he extended his hand to miracles*, as his Diſciples with exultation conteſſed? Are not theſe *Indians* new Chriſtians as the other in *Iury* were? Did not Chriſt euen then when he gaue power to worke miracles, expreſly ſay, *that he would be with them* (not for this or that age) *but vnto the end of the world*? How then doth this arrogant-ſylly-graſ-hopper inſult here in fauour of Infidels, and diſgrace of Chriſtians, calling them, *lying miracles amongſt the Indians*? Hath he perchance euer byn there? Hath he aduentured his life to gaine thoſe ſoules vnto Chriſt, that dyed for them, as others haue donne? Hath he ſuffered hunger and thirſt, could and heates, perſecution and affliction with loſſe of his bloud for gayning of thoſe poore *Indian* ſoules, as others haue ſuffered, and doe dayly? Noe. He hath done nothing of this, but contrary wiſe ſtood a farre of in *England*, hath attended to good cheare and eaſe, procured benefices and fauour of the State, and now vpon the ſuddaine is become an aduocate for the *Indian* Pagans, to ſcorne at the Chriſtian miracles wrought by Gods power among them, thongh teſtified by neuer ſo great and graue Authority vnto vs. And is not this a pious man thinke yow.

Miracles vvrought by God for the cõuerſion of the Indians ſcoffed at by T. M. Act. 4.

Marc. vlt.

32. As for *S. Francis louſe*, I neuer heard of that ſcorne before,

The contumely of T. M. about S. Francis louse.

before, and I meruaile in what part of our Theologicall assertions he will place it, or how he will deduce the harbouring of this *louse* from our enthraled opinion *of our neuer-erring Priest-hood.* For soe he must, if he talke to the purpose. And when he will or can doe this, euery man seeth. In the meane space, I leaue it to that glorious Saint now in heauen, where no *lise* be, to answere the contumely, if he thinke good, either vpon earth or else where. Sure I am that I haue reade of strange euentes in some vpon lesse pride and insolency vsed towardes the Seruantes of God then this. The examples most knowne are of Herods *lise*, that deuoured him; and if we belieue Doctor *Bolsacke* the Phisitian of *Geneua*, *Iohn Caluin* dyed of the like disease. God defend all good men, and T. *M.* also from like chastisement, and cure the rage of his cõtumelious & blasphemous tõgue, whilest he hath time of repẽtãce. 33. And now for that this Epistle groweth ouer longe, and we shall haue large occasions afterwardes to lay open this mans defects in these behalfes, we shall goe no further in examining of matters heere, but passe to the treatise it self designed to procure (if it be possible) some Mitigation of affliction & persecution towards Catholicke Subiects, drawne into publique hatred, exulceration and exceration by such diuelish Sycophancy and odious Calumniations, as this fellow and his like haue cast forth against them, without al groũd, but of malice & hatred, as by his accusations and our answeres, I doubt not, yow wil manifestly perceiue. I beseech Christ Iesus our Sauiour to turne all to his greater glory, & then happy are our suffrings: & so to his holy prouidence & protection I cõmit the whole.

Your louing Countreyman, that wisheth your best good. P. R.

A TABLE.

A TABLE

Of the particular Contentes, Chapters, and Paragraphes of the ensuing TREATISE.

THE *Preface to all true harted Englishmen, that loue the honour, safety, and best good of their Nation, Prince and Countrey; of the present diuision and disagreement about matters of religion in England, and of so many importune exasperations vsed by diuers sortes of men, to encrease the same: and namely by this Minister* Th. Morton *his iniurious libell.* Pag. 1. 1.

That the maine Proposition insinuated and vrged by T. M. That Catholickes are not tolerable in a Protestant Common welth in respect of Rebellion and Conspiracies *is vntrue, indiscreet, and pernicious; and falleth rather vpon Protestant-subiects then Catholiks.* Chap. I. pag. 31 2.

Ten Reasons or rather Calumniations brought by T. M. *for maintenance of his former Proposition:* That Catholike people are intolerable in a Protestant Gouernment, in respect of disloyalty, conspiracies and rebellion, *confuted, and returned vpon himselfe and his.* Chap. II. p. 52. 3.

How this Treatise was layed aside by sickness of the Author and some other causes: And why it was taken in hand againe vpon the sight of a Cath. Answere, and a new Reply of T. M. *dedicated to his Maiesty; with the Authors iudgement of them both.* Chap. III. pag. 89. 4.

What the Minister Thomas Morton *doth in this Reply and full satisfaction answere, concerning the former point of Charge against Protestants for Rebellion, Conspiracies, and disobedience; the effect whereof is drawne to three principall Questions.* Chap. IIII. pag. 103. 5.

6. *The first Question about Heretickes & heresy*, §. 1 pag. 105.
7. *The second Question about seditious doctrine*; para. 2. p. 112.
8. *The third Question cõcerning practice of Rebelliõ*, §. 3 p. 122.
9. *A briefe Censure is giuen of a new Treatise set forth by* T. M. *intituled*; A Confutation of the Popes Supremacy, as supreme head of rebellion, &c. *annexed to his former iustification of Protestant-Princes for matters of Rebellion.* Chap. V. pag. 139.
10. *The second Part of this Chapter conteyning three particular kindes of proofes, alleaged by* T. M. *against the Popes supremacy, to witt: Out of the new and old Testament, & from Reason it selfe.* pag. 159.
11. *A brief view of certaine notorious, false and fraudulent dealings vsed by* T. M. *in this his short seuerall Treatise against the Popes Supremacy: As also sundry examples of the like proceeding in the former part of his deceytfull Reply.* Chap. VI. pag. 189.
12. *The second part of this Chapter representing some of the falsifications which are vttered in the former Part of* M. Mortons *reply; which came to our hands after our Answere made before in our second Chapter against his ten Reasons.* pag. 218.
13. *The third Part of this Chapter conteyning a Controuersy,* VVhether *Calvin* fauoured Arianisme, or no; *with diuers strightes of* T. Morton *about the same.* pag. 244.
14. *Of the second Generall Point of Calumniation set forth against Catholickes by* T. Morton *concerning* Equiuocation, *which is reduced to certaine particular Considerations for better discussion therof,* Chap. VII. pag. 273.
15. *The substance of the Cause is entred into; and it is discussed,* What Equiuocation, what truth, what falsity, and lying is: *and some other pointes to this effect,* Chap. VIII. pag. 307.
16. *The second Part of this Chapter,* VVhether *a mixt Proposition partly vttered, and partly reserued in mynd, may be a true Logicall Proposition and Enunciation,* §. 1. pag. 321.
17. *The third Part of this Chapter,* VVhether *the former mixt*

Pro-

Proposition, partly vttered, and partly reserued, be aly or noe? §. 2. pag. 335.

The truth before set downe is further debated and proued by 18.
the assertions of Schoole-Doctors, Deuines, Lawyers, both Canon and Ciuill, Reasons, Practice of the Aduersaryes, and by the very instinct of nature it selfe, Chap. IX. pag. 348.

The first Point about Schoole-Deuines, Doctors and Lawyers, 19.
§. 1. pag. 349.

The second Point touching Scriptures and Fathers, for mixt 20.
and reserued Propositions, §. 2. pag. 358.

The third Point concerning other Scriptures alleaged, and pre- 21.
tended to be answered by T. Morton, §. 3. pag. 369.

The fourth and last Point of this Chapter, about Scriptures 22.
and Fathers, that defended Equiuocation from the name and nature of deceipt and fallacy with some other proofes out of common Reason, &c. §. 4. pag. 396.

Of certaine particular cases, and occasions, wherin it may be 23.
lawfull to vse the manner of Equiuocation or Amphibology before set downe, either in speach or oath, with the reasons therof, Chap. X. pag. 406.

The first case about the Secret of Confession, §. 1. pag. 407. 24.

The second case about Secretes of the Cōmōwelth §. 2. p. 411. 25.

The third case about any Party accused or called in Question, 26.
§. 3. pag. 414.

The argumentes and groundes of this Common opinion, §. 4. 27.
pag. 420.

The fourth case about VVitnesses, §. 5. 425. 28.

The fifth case about Equiuocation in swearing, §. 6. pag. 427. 29.

Diuers other cases in particular, §. 7. pag. 430. 30.

The argumentes and Reasons of T. Mortons *booke are exa-* 31.
mined and answered: and his notorious errors, follyes, and falsifications therin discouered, Chap. XI. pag. 439.

His first argument from the definition of a ly, §. 1. pag. 442. 32.

His second Argument from the Definition of Equiuocation, 33.
§. 2. pag. 444.

His third Argument frō the description of lying, §. 3. p. 447. 34.

His

35. His fourth Argument is taken a specie, or from a particular kind of lying, which is periury, §. 4. pag. 449.
36. His fifth Argument, Truth God, lying the Diuell, parag. 5. pag. 453.
37. His six Argument intituled, from examples of dissimulation condemned by Scriptures, Fathers, Pagans, &c. §. 6. pag. 457.
38. His example of Pagan writers out of Cicero. §. 7. pag. 462.
39. His seuenth Argument taken from a signe, an Interpreter, a coyne, and Giges-ring, §. 8. pag. 466.
40. Of his second Conclusion and proofes therof, para. 9. p. 468.
41. Of two sortes of Equiuocation, the one true and lawfull; the other false and sinfull: And that Catholickes only vse the first in certaine cases, and with circumstances and limitations: But T. Morton and his fellowes impugning the first, do vse ordinarily the second, which is false and lying Equiuocation. Chap. XII. pag. 483.
42. The vse of Equiuocation in some Protestant English Bishops, §. pag. 490.
43. Six arguments of M. Iewell Superintendent of Salisbury his hypocrisy in this case, §. pag. 493.
44. Six examples of M. Iewels particular Equiuocation, §. 3. pag. 504.
45. The vse of Equiuocating in English Protestants Ministers, §. pag. 517.
46. The vse of Equiuocation in Laymen & Knightes, §. p. 529.
47. The Conclusion of the whole worke, with a briefe exhortation vnto Catholickes not to vse the liberty of Equiuocation, euen in lawfull cases, but where some vrgent occasion inducth them thervnto.
48. A Table of the particular matters conteyned in the whole booke pag.

TO ALL

TO ALL TRVE-HARTED ENGLISH-MEN,

That loue the honour, safety, and best good of their Nation, Prince, and Countrey.

THE PREFACE.

OF THE PRESENT DIVISION AND DISAGREEMENT

About matters of Religion in England, and of many importune exasperations vsed by diuers sortes of men, to encrease the same: and namely by this Minister T. M. his iniurious Libell.

I DOE *not see (deare Countreymen) why I may not iustly (our tymes & circumstances therof considered) begin these my first lynes of Preface with those wordes of Complaint and Admiration of the Poet* Lucan, *wherby in few verses he comprehended and laid forth the rufull state of the*

rented Common-welth and Romane Empire by ciuill warres, saying:

* *Anglicanos.* **Flemus.*

Bella per * Æmathios pluſquam ciuilia campos
Iuſq; datum ſceleri * canimus: populumq; potẽtem,
In ſua victrici conuerſum viſcera dextra.

2. *For if heere we change but* Theſſalian fieldes *into* Engliſh land, *and the Poets* ſinging, *into our weeping and wailing, all the reſt agreeth moſt aptly, if our diuiſion be not more rufull and lamentable then that of the Romanes. For firſt our wars may truly be ſaid to be* plus quam ciuilia, *more then ciuill, in that they are not only internall, but domeſticall alſo, in ſuch ſorte, as no one Prouince, no one towne, no one village, no one howſe or family is lightly to be found, where ſome parte or other of this warre and diſſention vpon difference of Religion taketh not ſome holde: The Father ſomewhere accuſing or ſuſpecting his children: the children flying or fearing their Father: the Mother entring into iealoſie with her daughter: the daughter not truſting or confiding in her Mother: the brother impugning his brother, and wife complaining of her husband: the friend breaking*

Plus quàm ciuilia.

The pittifull Staie of Englād.

with

with his friend: and the neereſt of kyn with thoſe whome lawe of nature, & band of bloud did moſt ſtraitly combine & knit togeather.

3. *Neither is this warre ended only in wordes, or in bare debate of mindes, iudgements, willes and affections, but it breaketh forth alſo into workes, and hoſtile actions, to the ſight and admiration of all the worlde, no aduerſary Camps or armies ſtanding more watchfull and diſtruſtfull one of an other, or vſing more ſtratagems of diſcouery, ſpiery, preuention or impugnation, the one againſt the other, then we among our ſelues; wherof our continuall ſearches, priuy intelligences, bloudy and deſperate conſpiracies, apprehenſions, impriſonments, tortures, arraignementes, condemnations and executions are moſt loathſome and lamentable witneſſes.*

4 *And as for* Ius datum ſceleri, *neuer could it be ſpoken ſo properly in the Romans miſery as in ours, when in deed (though in ſome different ſenſe) that which was* ius *before, is now* ſcelus, *to vvitt, that which was lawe, right, and equity vnder Catholicke Religion, is now offenſiue and punishable by the lawes of* Proteſtants, Iuſque datum ſceleri.

teſtants, *that which was then piety, is now iniquity, that which by them was vſed for deuotion, is now ſcorned for* ſuperſtition, *that which they reuerenced for higheſt Religion, is now held in contempt and greateſt deriſion; ſuch as then should haue byn hated and puniſhed for hereticks, are now eſteemed for Chriſtian and beſt reformed Catholicks, and they vvhich in thoſe dayes vvere called* Catholicks, *as vvell by their enemyes as themſelues, and ſate in iudgement vpon the reſt, are now brought into iudgement vnder them vvhoſe iudges at that tyme they vvere, in the ſelf ſame cauſe, right and lawe being changed vvith the tyme, and equity vvith mens affections, articles of olde faith become crymes of new treaſon, and finally all ſo inuerted and turned vpſide downe, and the differences ſo purſued vvith ſuch hoſtile emnity of exulcerated mindes, as the Poets concluſion falleth vpon vs euidently in the eye of all Chriſtendome, that vve being a potent people, and dreadfull otherwiſe to all our neighbours, haue turned our victorious hands into our owne bowels, by this diſunion in Religion, and therby haue iuſt cauſe to feare*

Populumque potentem in ſua, &c.

the

the euent and inference threatned by our Sa-
uiour (except his holy hand protect vs) that;
Euery Kingdome deuided in itſelfe ſhall Mat.12.
come to deſolation.

5. *And that vvhich moſt encreaſeth the fee-*
ling of this miſery is, that no man endeauoreth
to mollify matters, but all to exaſperate; no
man applieth lenitiues, but all corroſiues; no
man powreth in vvyne or oyle into the vvound,
but all ſalte and vinegar; no man byndeth Exaſpe-
vp or fomenteth, but euery one ſeeketh to rations.
crush, bruze, and breake more; all cry and clap
their hands to exulceration, ſaying with the
children of Edom, *in the day of* Hieruſalems
affliction: Exinanite, exinanite, vſque ad Pſal.136.
fundamentum in ea. *Pull her downe, pull*
her downe euen vnto the foundation.

6. *And to this effect haue vve heard and*
ſeene many ſpeeches and ſermons made, ſundry
Bookes and pamphlets caſt abroad or ſet forth
in print, ſome before the late cruell and hate- Mali-
full conſpiracy (which might perhaps be ſome tious ex-
incitation to the deſignemẽt or haſtening ther- tenſion.
of, and ſome preſently therupon, not only to
exaggerate that fact (whoſe atrocity by it ſelf

is ſuch, as ſcarſely it leaueth any place to exaggeration) but alſo to extend and draw out the hatred and participation therof to others of the ſame Religion moſt innocent therin, yea vnto the whole multitude, ſo far as in them lieth, a matter of exorbitant iniuſtice and intemperate malice.

Of bookes and pamphletes.

7. *Of the former ſorte of bookes and pamphlets we haue ſeene one ſet forth the yeare paſt by* Thomas Hamond, *intituled*: The late Commotion of certeine Papiſts in Hereford Shire, about the buriall of one Alice VVellington Recuſant, after the Popish manner, in the tovvne of Alenſ-moore, tvvo miles frō Hereford &c. *VVhich thing though it were but the fact of a few poore countrey people Catholickly affected (as moſt are knowne to be in thoſe partes) to bury the ſaid* Alice, *and that in a ſorte they were forced therunto, leaſt the dead corps ſhould rot aboue ground (the Miniſter of the place moſt obſtinatly refuſing to bury the ſame) and that ſome other falſe companion in like manner is thought to haue byn ſet a worke to induce them into that trap, as ſince hath byn vnderſtood: yet*

Commotion of vvales.

was

was the matter ſo exaggerated euery where, both by bookes, preachings, and publike ſpeeches of Magiſtrates, as if it had byn a moſt heinous attempt in deed: and not only theſe, but by this occaſion all Catholicks generally were moſt odiouſly traduced, eſpecially in this one point (that touched them neereſt) to wit, that they would ſeeme to conceaue any leaſt hope of his Maieſties clemency and mercy towardes them by way of toleration or conniuency for their Religion, or mitigation of their continuall preſſures for the ſame.

8. *To which end were brought into this booke and published in print not only the Biſhop of* London *his ſermon at* Paules *Croſſe vpon the fifth of Auguſt then paſt, wherin he auowed his Maieſties proteſtation againſt Catholickes to the contrary, but the ſpeach alſo and charge of the* L. Chancellour *in the Star-chamber vnto the Lordes, Iudges, and communalty there preſent ready to departe into their countryes, was deliuered as from the Kings owne mouth, all tending to the ſame end of afflicting, and diſgracing the ſaid people, and depriuing them of all hope of any*

In the Epiſtle of T.H. 22. Iunij 1605.

of any tolerance, yea * ſcoffing moſt bitterly and contemptuouſly at their folly, for conceauing any ſuch vaine hopes, and inioyning the moſt ſeuere order for deſcrying, ſearching, apprehending, impriſoning, and punishing them, which euer lightly was heard of, as though they had byn the only or moſt grieuous maleſactors within the Realme, and this only for their Religion.

* Auant falſe and lying Varlets (ſaith one) your vvordes are vaine, and your hopes are more vaine.

9. Soone after vpon the backe of this, came forth S. Edvvard Cooke his Maieſtyes Attorneyes Booke, intituled by him: his Fifth Part of Reportes: which though in the entrance, and fore-front it promiſed more calme and mild proceeding (and ſo it performeth in phraſe and ſtyle of writing) yet was the drift and ending therof no leſſe ſtinging, then the Scorpions tayle it ſelf, againſt all ſortes of Catholicks and their Religion. And to ſay ſomewhat of it in this place, his argument or ſubiect was new and ſtrange, taking vpon him to proue out of the old and ancient common lawes of England, that the ſpirituall iuriſdiction giuen by Act of Parlament to the late Queene Elizabeth in the firſt yeare of her raigne, and exerciſed

Sir Edward Cookes booke againſt Catholicks.

His argument.

exerciſed afterwardes by her in Eccleſiaſti-call matters, was dew vnto her, not only by vertue of that Statute, but by vigour alſo of the ſaid ancient common lawes, and ſo acknowledged and practiſed by the olde ranke of our foregoing Kinges and Princes: a concluſion no leſſe ſtrange and paradoxicall in wiſe and learned mens eares, then that was of him who diuers ages after the warres of Troy *ended, and the true ſucceſſe therof published by all writers throughout the world, tooke vpon him to teach the contrary, to wit, that not the* Grecians, *but the* Troianes *had the victory in that warre, and ſo to reuerſe and contradicte whatſoeuer had byn written, taught, or receaued before.*

10. *Let the hiſtories of our Chriſtian* English *Kings euen from the firſt conuerted* Ethelbert, *vnto King* Henry *the eight be examined whether this be ſo or not, and whether a thouſand monuments of theirs (in almoſt a thouſand yeares) doe not teſtify them all to haue byn of contrary iudgment, practice, ſenſe, and beliefe (in the controuerſy propoſed) to that which* M. Attorney *by a few pieces of lawes*

*distractedly alleadged, woulde haue men to thinke. Or if he delight (as I take him to be learned) to haue this argument more discussed (for it is both ample and important) let him but procure licence for his Antagonist, to write and print his booke, and I doubt not but that he will quickly be answered by some of his owne profession, among whome I doe imagine that many fingers must needes itch and tickle to be doing in so aduantagious a cause: or if not, yet doe I dare assure him, that some Deuine of our side shall ioine issue with him in that point, for the * confutation of his whole drifte, and narration in those his* Reportes, *but principally in the ouerthrowing of his iniurious conclusion, wherby he would inferre, that whosoeuer did not belieue and acknowledge the said late Queenes Ecclesiasticall feminine authority, power, and iurisdiction in spirituall matters, was and is a traitor by the iudgment of the ancient common lawes of* England, *receaued, helde, and practised euen vnder Catholicke Kinges and Princes of former times.*

M. Attorneyes paradox of English Kings.

* Now I heare it is answered.

11. *Vnto which vntrue and improbable paradox, he addeth another no lesse stinging,*

nor

nor better founded then the former, which is that for the foremoſt eleuen yeares of Queene Elizabeths *raigne, vntill she was excommunicated by* Pius Quintus: No ſorte of people of vvhat perſvvaſion ſoeuer in Religion, refuſed to goe to the Proteſtantes Church (*which is euidently falſe, both in many Puritanes and more Catholicks that refuſed openly in that time) and then*: That vpon that occaſion Catholicks firſt began to refuſe (*which in like manner is falſe, both for that they refuſed before, and this occaſion was altogeather impertinent to their refuſall) and thirdly moſt iniuriouſly of all, he would further ſeeme to inferre, that ſuch as refuſe now, may in like manner be preſumed to doe it vpon the ſame vndutifull minde towardes his Maieſty. All which points doe tend to the exaſperation and exulceration which euery one ſeeth, and comming from a man of his place, roome, and neerenes in office about his Maieſty, could not but make deepe impreſſion, and giue perhaps a great push to the lamentable precipitation of thoſe vnfortunate Gentlemen that ſoone after enſued.*

False & odious aſſertiõs of M. Attorney.

12. *VVhich being hapned, came forth presently this other odious pamphlet of* T. M. *his deuised* discouery *(wherunto now I am forced in particuler to answere) it being in it self no lesse slaunderous and iniurious, then the fact of the conspirators was wicked and grieuous to all Catholickes.* The booke beareth this title: An exact discouery of Romish doctrine in case of Conspiracy and Rebellion: *But he that shall weigh it well, shall finde it a more exacte discouery of English Ministeriall malice, in case of sycophancy and calumniation; the Authour endeauoring to ascribe that to publicke and generall doctrine, which proceeded from priuate and particuler passion, as also to drawe the temerity of a few, to the hatred and condemnation of the whole. Of which iniquity we shall haue occasion to speake more afterward in due place.*

The booke of T. M. about Romish doctrine

13. *Soone after this pamphlet appeared many more, tending all for the most part to the same end of exulceration, or driuing rather to plaine desperation, euery one adding affliction to affliction, and heaping hatred and enuy vpon them that detested & bewailed the transgression*

greſſion happened, no leſſe, but much more then theſe inſolent inſultors themſelues. Of this kinde I might name ſundry that my ſelf haue ſeene (though being out of England *I may preſume to haue ſeene the leaſt part of ſuch as haue byn published and ſet forth ſince this fact fell out) as namely one intituled:* A Diſcourſe of the late intended Treaſon; *wherin the diſcourſer beginneth with this foundation:* That all English, both at home and abroad, vvere ſo fully in poſſeſſion of contented peace at the time vvhen this treaſon vvas plotted, as, *to vſe his owne wordes*, no forreine grudge, no invvard vvhiſpering of diſcõtentment did any vvay appeare. *VVhich aſſertion if you conſider it well, and compare it with our domeſticall differences in Religion, and variety of punishments laied vpon diuers ſortes of men at that time (euen before this fact fell out) for the ſame, will ſeeme a very great hyperbolicall exaggeration, and ouerlashing: for that the penalties of Recuſancy and other like moleſtations were as rife then as at any other time before, & complaintes of Catholickes in diuers countreys no leſſe pittifull.*

A diſcourſe vvithout name of Author or truth of argument.

14. *Another like Treatiſe followed this, intituled*: A true reporte of the impriſonment, arraignment, and execution of the late Traitors, imprinted by Geffery Chorlton: *VVhich ſo raileth vpon Catholicks, and Catholicke Religion from the very beginning to the end therof, as if none of them had byn free from the fact attempted, or that their common doctrine had publickly allowed the ſame; whereunto this ſeditious libell of the miniſter T. M. which now I am to confute endeauoreth to beare falſe witnes. I will pretermit two other moſt virulent and ſpitefull Treatiſes intituled*: Pagano-Papiſmus, *and* The picture of a Papiſt; *in which the Religion wherin all our auncestors both liued and died from the beginning of their Chriſtianity vnto our daies, and ſo many worthy nations, great Princes, and famous learned men doe profeſſe round about vs at this day, and doe hope to be ſaued therby, is made worſe then* Paganiſme, *yea the horrible ſinke of all* damnable hereſies, *which notwithſtanding were condemned by the ſame Religion and Church in former ages, and conſequently this*

Another Treatiſe.

Two other furious bookes.

ly this cenſure ſauoureth more of fury then of reaſon.

15. *But to leaue of the recitall of any more bookes or pamphlets to this effect, there hath appeared further a matter of far greater importance, which is a Catalogue of new lawes ſuggeſted in this Parlament againſt the ſaid Catholickes, wherin beſides the former heape of penall ſtatutes made to this affliction in precedent times, diuers new are propoſed for an addition and aggrauation of their Calamities, far more rigorous (if they* *paſſe) *then the former; which being conſidered by forreine people doe make the ſtate of English Catholickes vnder Proteſtant gouernement to ſeeme vnto them much more miſerable and intolerable, then that of the* Ievves *vnder any ſorte of Chriſtian Princes, or that of the* Grecians, *or other Chriſtians vnder the* Turke, *or* Perſian; *or that of bond-ſubiectes vnder the* Polonians, Svvecians, Moſcouians, *and other ſuch Nations: ſo as all this tendeth as yow ſee (and as before we haue noted) to more deſperate diſunion of mindes and exaſperation of hartes.*

* Now they are paſſed.

16. *Only*

16. *Only I muſt confeſſe, that in two mens writings I finde more moderation, then in any of the reſt; who yet being more intereſſed in the late grieuous deſigned delict, then any of the other that write therof, had moſt cauſe to be prouoked againſt the delinquents The firſt is his Maieſties ſpeach both in his Proclamation, and Court of Parlament. In the former he profeſſeth* to diſtinguish betvveene all others, calling themſelues Catholicks, & the Authors of deteſtable treaſon, and that by good experience he vvas ſo vvell perſuaded of the loyalty of diuers of that profeſſion, as that he aſſured himſelfe that they did as much abhorre that odious conſpiracy, as himſelfe. *And in the ſecond, his Maieſty ſpeaking in Parlament, diſtinguiſhed betweene different ſortes of Catholicks, allowing to the one ſort both the opinion of loyalty and poſsibility of ſaluation,* deteſting in that point (*to vſe his Highnes wordes*) the cruelty of the Puritanes, and thinking it vvorthy of fier, that vvill admit no ſaluation to any Papiſt: *VVhich is an argument of his Princely moderate meaning, not*

The Princely moderation of his Maieſty in his ſpeach.

to

to condemne the whole for a part: though in our ſenſe the diſtinction vſed by his Maieſty in that place of ſome Catholicks that holde ſome pointes of our Religion, and of others that holde all, cannot ſtand. *For that we accompt them not for Catholicks at all (nor may wee) that holde not all, but a part, for that* Catholicum *is* ſecundum totum, *and not* ſecundum partem, *as well* S. Auguſtine *noteth, and conſequently he that belieueth a part only or any one iote leſſe then the whole, cannot be in our ſenſe, nor in that of* S. Auguſtine, *a true Catholicke.*

VVhat is Catholicum according to S. Auguſtine.

17. *And ſurely though his Maieſty in this place, out of the preiudicate perſuaſions of others, and ſiniſter ſuggeſted informations, ſeeme to be perſuaded that no Catholicks of this condition that belieue and imbrace the whole,* can euer proue either good Chriſtians, or faithfull ſubiects: *yet is our hope and conſtant praier to almighty* God, *that he will in time ſo illuſtrate that excellent vnderſtanding of his Highnes, as the ſame will ſee and diſcerne betweene theſe abſolute and perfect*

VVhich is the beſt ſort of Catholicks

Catholicks that yeeld themſelues wholy in obſequium & obedientiam fidei, *in all that the vniuerſall Church preſcribeth vnto them to be belieued, and others that chuſe, take, and leaue what they like or liſt vpon their owne iudgement: which choice or election (called otherwiſe hereſy) if wee belieue the Holy Scriptures and ſenſe of all antiquity in this behalfe, is the moſt dangerous and pernicious diſeaſe (in reſpect of both thoſe effects heere mentioned by his Maieſty) that is vpon earth. And when his Highnes ſhall further with deliberation and maturity haue pondered, how many ages his noble Auncеſtors, Catholicke Kings and Queenes of both Realmes haue raigned in peace, honour and ſafty ouer ſubiects of the firſt ſorte, and how infinite troubles, turmoiles, violences, dangers, hurtes, and loſſes his Maieſties owne perſon, and all his neereſt in bloud and kinred, haue ſuffered in a few yeares of thoſe other new chuſers (to omit their doctrine) I doubt not but that out of his great prudence and equanimity, he will mollify and mitigate the hard opinion conceaued of the former, notwith-*

withſtanding this late odious accident fallen out by the temerity of a few, as the world knoweth.

18. *The ſecond example of ſome moderation before mentioned, (or at leaſt wiſe meant) was my L. of* Salisburies *anſwere to* Certeine ſcandalous papers, as he called *them; which though being written in the time and occaſion they were, the anſwerer wanteth not his ſtinges that pearce euen to the quicke: yet ſuppoſing the pretended iniury offered by that fond menacing letter, and the condition of men in his place and dignity, not accuſtomed to beare or diſſemble prouocations of that kind, all may be called moderate that is not extreme: though for the letter it ſelf (if any ſuch were) I preſume ſo much of his Lordships wiſedome and prudence, as he could hardly deeme or ſuſpect any Catholicke to be ſo mad, as to write ſuch a franticke commination, but rather that it came from the forge of ſome ſuch other, as togeather with the blowe to be giuen therby to all Catholickes, had furthermore a deſire to drawe forth from his L. the anſwere,*

My Lord of Salisbury his booke.

therby to ſee and try his ſtyle, and to that end gaue him ſo vrging an occaſion, as by his friendes is thought that in the conueniency of reaſon and honour, he coulde not well omit to accept therof as he did, and performed the enterpriſe in ſuch manner, as might be expected at his L. handes; to wit, as himſelf writeth of his Maieſties ſpeach in the Parlament, Eucry line declaring the vvorkeman.

19. *Only I may not let paſſe to note by the way, that in two points of diuinity, touched by him of the Popes authority, concerning Princes and the lawfulnes of Equiuocation in certaine caſes, as they are matters not apperteining properly to his faculty, and profeſſion: ſo muſt I thinke that his Deuine did ſomewhat miſtake, or miſinforme him therin.*

Againſt my Lord of Saliſburies Deuine.

For of the firſt, thus he writeth: that he hath byn a long time ſory, that ſome cleere explication of the Papall authority hath not byn made by ſome publicke and definitiue ſentence orthodoxall &c. *He addeth further this reaſon of his deſire:* That not only thoſe Princes vvhich acknovvledge this Superiority might be ſecured

from

from feares and iealoſies of continuall treaſons and bloudy Aſſaſſinates againſt their perſons, but thoſe Kings alſo vvhich doe not approue the ſame, & yet vvould faine reſerue a charitable opinion of their ſubiectes, might knovv hovv farre to repoſe themſelues in their fidelity in ciuill obedience, hovvſoeuer they ſee them deuided from them in poiut of conſcience &c.

20. *To the former clauſe touching his L. deſire to haue the matter defined and declared, his Deuine might eaſely haue informed him, that among Catholicke people the matter is cleare, and ſufficiently defined, and declared in all pointes wherin there may be any doubt concerning this affaire. As for example in three thinges queſtion may be made: firſt whether any authority were left by Chriſt in his Church and Chriſtian commonwealth to reſtraine or repreſſe, cenſure or iudge any exorbitant and pernicious exceſſe of Great men, States or Princes, or that he had left them remediles wholy by any ordinary authority? In which caſe as in other*

The firſt queſtion about authority ouer Princes.

common-wealthes that are not Christian, all Philosophers, law-makers, Senatours, Counsellours, Historiographers, and other sortes of soundest wisedome, prudence, and experience, either Iew or Gentile, haue from the beginning of the world concurred in this; that God and nature hath left some sufficient authority in euery common wealth, for the lawfull, and orderly redressing of those euilles, euen in the highest persons. Nor did euer Philosopher of name, or law-maker hitherto deny this assertion, as founded in the very law of nature, nations, and reason it selfe.

21. *So when Christ our Sauiour came to found his common-wealth of Christians in farre more perfection then other states had byn established before, subiecting temporall thinges to spirituall, according to the degree of their natures, endes, and eminencies, and appointing a supreme vniuersall Gouernour in the one, with a generall charge to looke to all his sheepe, without exception of great or small, people or potentates: vpon these suppositions (I say) all Catholicke learned men do ground, and haue euer grounded, that in*

Christian

Christian common-wealthes, not only the foresaid ordinary authority is left, which euery other state and Kingdome had by God and nature to preserue and protect themselues in the cases before laid downe; but further also for more sure, and orderly proceeding therin, that the supreme care, iudgment, direction and censure of this matter was left principally by Christ our Sauiour vnto the said supreme Gouernour, and Pastour of his Church and common-wealth. And in this there is no difference in opinion or beliefe betweene any sorte of Catholickes whatsoeuer (so they be Catholickes) though in particular cases, diuersity of persons, time, place, cause, and other circumstances, may moue some diuersity of opinions. And thus much of the first question.

22. *The second may be about the manner how this authority, or in what sorte it was giuen by Christ to his said supreme Pastour, whether directly or indirectly, immediatly or by a certaine consequence. As for example, whether Christ, as he gaue the generall charge of his sheepe to S. Peter and his Successours* The second question.

directly

directly and immediatly in ſpirituall matters, by that commiſsion three times repeated in S. Iohn: Paſce oues meas; *which wordes include, according to Catholicke expoſition, not only authority to feed, but to gouerne alſo, direct, reſtraine, cure, repreſſe, and correct, when need is, as we ſee it doth appertaine to a temporall sheepheardes office: ſo whether with this commiſsion in ſpirituall affaires, our Sauiour gaue alſo immediatly and directly, the charge and ouerſight of temporalities in like manner, or rather indirectly and by a certaine conſequence: that is to ſay, that when the gouernment of ſpirituall affaires, to wit, of ſoules to their eternall bliſſe and ſaluation is ſo letted, or impugned by any temporall gouernours, as the ſaid ſpirituall commiſsion cannot be executed without redreſſe or remedy; in ſuch caſes, and not otherwiſe, the ſaid ſupreme paſtour to haue authority to proceed alſo againſt the ſaid temporall Gouernours, for defence and preſeruation of his ſpirituall charge. Of which queſtion the Canoniſtes doe commonly defend the firſt part, but Catholicke Deuines for the moſt part the*

ſecond:

ſecond: but both partes fully agree, that there is ſuch an Authority lefte by Chriſt in his Church, for remedy of vrgent caſes, for that otherwiſe he should not haue ſufficiently prouided for the neceſsity therof. So as this difference of the manner maketh no difference at all in the thing it ſelfe.

23. *The third queſtion may be about the cauſes, for which this authority may be vſed, as alſo the forme of proceeding to be obſerued therin; wherabout there are ſo many particularities to be conſidered, as are ouerlong for this place: only it is ſufficient for Catholicke men to know, that this may not be done without iuſt cauſe, graue and vrgent motiues, and due forme alſo of proceeding, by admonition, preuention, interceſſion, and other like preambles, preſcribed by Eccleſiaſticall Canons to be obſerued, wherby my Lordships doubtes of feares, and ieloſies* of continuall treaſons, and bloudy aſſaſſinates *may iuſtly be remoued. For that this authority doth not only not allow any ſuch wicked, or vnlawfull attemptes of priuate men, but doth alſo expreſſely and publickly* The third queſtiõ.

condemne the ſame and the doctrine therof, as may appeare not only by the condemnation of VVicklifs *wicked article, in the Coun-*
Seſſ.15. *cell* of Conſtance, *wherin he affirmed:* That it vvas lavvfull for euery priuate man to kill any Prince vvhome he held to be a Tyrant, *but alſo by like condemnation of* Caluin, Beza, Ottoman, Bucchanan, Knox, Goodman, *and others of that ſect, who hold and practice in effect the ſame doctrine of* VVickliffe, *concerning Princes, if not worſe, as ſhall more largely and particularly be declared afterward in the firſt and fourth Chapters of this Treatiſe. And this I deſire may ſatisfy his Lordship for the preſent, vntill we come to the foreſaid places where better occaſion in this kind will be offered.*

About the doctrine of Equiuocation.

24. *As for the ſecond point touched by his Lordship about the doctrine of* Equiuocation, *ambiguity of ſpeach, amphibology, or mentall reſeruation, in certaine caſes lawfull (which doctrine his Lordship termeth* ſtrange, and groſſe, and that it teareth in ſunder all the bandes of humane conuer-

conuerſation) *for that I am to handle this matter more largely and particularly in the enſuing Chapters of this booke, eſpecially from the fourth forward (the whole bulke of our aduerſaries calumniations conſiſting in theſe two pointes of Rebellion and Equiuocation) I will heere make anſwere to his Lordship, as to a man of ſcience and experience, that I maruaile greatly, how he can thinke* that doctrine to be ſtrange, *which is ſo ordinary and vſually to be ſeene in all the bookes of Catholicke Deuines for the ſpace of theſe three or foure hundred yeares, by confeſſion of his owne writers: how alſo he can tearme it* groſſe, *that the greateſt wittes of Chriſtendome, for ſo long at leaſt, haue held for learned, and founded not only vpon euident groundes of reaſon, nature, equity, and iuſtice in diuers caſes (and for ſuch allowed throughout all tribunales of Chriſtendome, both Eccleſiaſticall and Ciuill) but warranted alſo by authority of many expreſſe examples of Holy Scriptures and Fathers, and in ſome caſes ſo neceſſary for auoiding the ſinne of lying, periury,*

diſcouering of ſecrettes, iniuring our neighbours, and other ſuch inconueniences, as if I should heere ſet downe the ſaid particular caſes, both concerning ſecrecy or ſafty of him that is forced to equiuocate (as afterward I shall doe in conuenient place) I preſume his Lordship as ſo great a common-vvealthesman *would allow therof with due circumſtances, as iuſt and neceſſary, and recall that part of his cenſure wherin he ſaith:* That it teareth in ſunder all the bandes of humane conuerſation, *eſpecially if he remember, that we doe except from the licence of Equiuocation, the common conuerſation of men in contractes, bargaines, and other like affaires, wherby any dammage or preiudice may grow to another man, and much more in matters appertaining to the cleare and manifeſt profeſſion of our faith. And thus much for this place, the reſidue afterward.*

The lawfulnes, neceſſity, and circumſtances of Equiuocatiõ.

25. *And now hauing ſpoken all this by way of Preface, we shall returne to the particular Treatiſe of* T. M. (*for more of his name we cannot yet find out*) *entituled,* An exact diſcouery of Romiſh doctrine in caſe of con-

The argument of the enſuing booke againſt T. M.

conſpiracy &c. *which we haue taken in hand to anſwere in this place, and to shew that as his meaning is malicious, and meanes foolish: ſo is his propoſition pernicious, and argumentes vaine, to proue the ſame, wherin I remit me to that, which afterwardes yow shall ſee ſet downe.*

THAT THE MAYNE PROPOSITION INSINVATED AND VRGED BY T. M.

That Catholickes are not tolerable in a Proteſtant Common-vvealth in reſpect of Rebellion and Conſpiracies,

Is vntrue, indiſcreet and pernicious, and falleth rather vpon the Proteſtant-Subiect, then the Catholicke.

CHAP. I.

THe whole drift of the Author throughout this malignant inuectiue to be nothing els, but to perſwade, that Proteſtantes and Catholickes cannot liue togeather in one common-wealth, nor vnder one Prince or Gouernour, if he be a Proteſtant, is cleare and manifeſt by all his whole diſcourſe, prooſes and argumentes, which afterwardes we ſhall more particularly in due place diſcuſſe: yea to the end he may make this diuorce and ſeparation betweene

The main drift and ſeditious ſcope of T. M.

tweene the Kinges Maiesty of *Great Britany*, and his Catholicke subiectes (for thither he bendeth all his battery) the more irreconciliable and remediless he placeth the ground of this incomposibility, not in the will, which may be changed, but in the iudgement, and beliefe of Catholickes; to wit, in their publicke and receiued doctrine, which doctrine well he knoweth not to lye in the handes of particular men, nor of particuler Prouinces, to change or alter at their pleasure (as Protestantes may, and doe, heere taking a part, and there leauing as they list,) but they must stand firmely, and vniuersally to the whole, this being truely *Catholicum* as ancient Fathers define it. And hence it is, that T. M. inferreth thus: *It is taken out* (saith he) *of the expresse dogmaticall principles of their Priests and Doctors, and collected from their owne publicke positions &c.* which how true or false it is, shall appeare after. Now let vs examine some other circumstances of this proposition.

2. First then, I say and auerre, that this his maine and fundamentall axiome, of the incomposibility of Catholicke and Protestant people togeather, vnder the Gouernement of his Maiesty of *Great Britany*, is not only false and erroneous in it selfe (as afterward shalbe declared) but pernicious also to the commonwealth, preiudiciall to his Maiesties both comfort & safety, hurtefull to the state, seditious against peace, scandalous to the hearers, offensiue to forreine nations that liue vnder Princes of different Religion, both Catholicke and Protestant, and hatefull finally to the eares of all moderate, peaceable, and prudent people: and is on the other side no waies profitable, needfull, expedient, or conuenient thus in publique to be proposed. For I would first demaund this famous mak-bate, what gaine or vtility may be expected, either to Prince or people by putting in

The maine propositiō of T. M. censured.

print-

print this so odious an assertion of extreeme diffidence,and distrust betweene his Maiesty,and so many thousande of his subiects, that admitted him with all ioy & comfort at his first entrance to the Crowne? Is it(perhaps)to preuẽt some dãger that may be doubted from such kind of people,and to make his Maiesty more carefull and vigilant for his safty? If that be so,a priuate aduise had beene more important to himselfe, or his Counsell: for that the publishing and proclayming therof procureth not only diffidẽce,but also restles solicitude on both sides,the one to preuẽt the other.

3. Secondly I would aske,what he will doe, or haue to be done with so great a multitude of people, as in all his Maiesties Kingdomes doe loue and fauour the Religion, which this masked Minister impugneth, and would put them in despaire of any sufferance or tolerable condition vnder his Maiesties gouernment? Will he haue them all made away from the face of the Earth? This were hard,except *Noe* his floud should come againe, or some other equiualent inundation, either of water, fyer, or sword. And for the later, though some thinke he could wish it, yet who knoweth not,but that the bowels of England are so combyned and linked togeather at this day in this point, as hardly can the sword passe the one, but it must wound also deeply the other. What then? Will he haue them to liue in perpetuall torment,hatred,suspicions, iealosyes, auersions,detestations,& deadly hostilities, the one with the other? This is a state more fit for hell,then for any peaceable and Christian common wealth,nor of it selfe is it durable, if we beleeue either reason, or experience of former times. For we know what *Cicero*, what other wise-men among the very Heathens haue obserued, what they haue written, what they haue counselled to be done, or to be preuented in like occasions: to wit, that multitudes

Cicero lib. offic.

Inconueniences of exaſperation and deſpaire.

are not to be put in deſpaire, no nor particuler men into extreame exaſperation without hope of remedy: for that deſpaire is the mother of precipitation, & extreme exaſperation is the next dore to fury. No counſaile, no reaſon, no regard of Religion, nor other reſpect humaine or deuine holdeth place, when men grow deſperate, & all ſtringes of hope are cut of. We ſee by experience, that the leaſt and weakeſt wormes of the earth, which cannot abide the looke of a man, yet when they are extremely preſſed, and put in deſpaire of eſcape, they turne and leape in mans face it ſelfe, which otherwiſe they ſo much feare and dread.

4. Wherfore ſeing this dangerous ſtickler would put this extreme deſpaire into ſo many thouſandes of his Maieſties ſubiectes, yow many imagine what good ſeruice he meaneth to do him therby, and what pay he deſerueth for his labour. Surely if a great rich man, whoſe wealth lay in his flocke of ſheepe, had neuer ſo faire and fawning a dog, following neuer ſo diligently his trencher, and playing neuer ſo many flattering trickes before him; yet if togeather with this, he had that other curriſh quality alſo, as to woory his maiſters ſheepe, diſſeuer his fold, diſperſe his flock, and driue them into flight and precipitation; it is like that his Maiſter out of his wiſedome (though otherwiſe he were delighted with his officious fawning) would rather hange ſuch a dog, then aduenture to ſuffer ſo great and important loſſes by him. And no leſſe is to be expected of the great equity & prudence of our great *Monarch*, when he ſhall well conſider of the cauſe and conſequence therof.

Sheepe-biters not to be tolerated in a Common vvealth.

5. And thus much of the malice and pernicious ſequele of this aſſertion: let vs ſee ſomewhat now alſo of the folly & falſity therof. To which effect I would firſt enquire, if it be ſo that ſubiectes of different Religions

ligions are not comportable togeather, vnder a Prince that is of one of thoſe Religions (for ſo muſt the queſtion be propoſed if we will handle it in generall) then how doe the Iewes & Chriſtians liue togeather vnder many Chriſtian Princes in *Germany* and *Italy*? vnder the ſtate of *Venice*? yea vnder the Pope himſelfe? how doe Chriſtians and Turkes liue togeather vnder the Turkiſh Emperour of *Conſtantinople*, as alſo vnder the *Perſian* without perſecution for their Religion? how did *Catholickes* and *Arrians* liue ſo many yeares togeather vnder *Arrian* Kinges and Emperours in old times, both in *Spaine* and elſ where? how doe *Catholickes* and *Proteſtantes* liue togeather at this day vnder the moſt Chriſtian King of *France*? vnder the great King of *Polonia*? and vnder the German Emperour in diuers partes of his dominions (all Catholicke Princes) and in the free-cityes of the Empyre? And in particuler is to be conſidered that the *Hußites* haue liued now ſome hundreds of yeares in *Bohemia* vnder the Catholicke Princes and Emperours Lordes of that Countrey, with ſuch freedome of conuerſation with Catholicke ſubiectes, and vnion of obedience to the ſaid Princes, as at this day in the great Citty of *Praga*, where the Emperour commonly reſideth, and where Catholicks doe wholy gouerne, there is not ſo much as one Pariſh Church knowne to be in the handes of any Catholicke Paſtor of that citty but all are *Hußites* that haue the ordinary charges of ſoules; and Catholickes, for ſeruice, ſermons and Sacraments doe repaire only to monaſteries, according to ancient agreementes and conuentions betweene them, though in number the ſaid Catholickes be many times more then the other, and haue all the gouernment and Commaundry in their handes, as hath byn ſaid. Theſe are demonſtratiue proofes *ad hominem*, and cannot be denied, and conſequently doe

His vniuerſall propoſition improued by diuerſe particulers.

conuince that this make-bate Miniſters propoſition is falſe in generall: *That ſubiects of different religion, may not liue togeather in ciuill peace*, if their gouernours will permit them. Now if he can alleadge any ſeuerall weighty cauſes why this generall aſſertion holdeth not, or may not holde in the particuler caſe of Engliſh Catholiks and Proteſtants vnder our preſent King, we ſhall diſcuſſe them alſo, and ſee how much they weigh.

10. Reaſons. 6. He pretendeth ten ſeuerall reaſons in his pamphlet, for cauſes of this incompoſsibility, and therof doth his whole inuectiue conſiſt. Eight of them appertaine to doctrine and practice of rebellion in vs, as he auoucheth; and the other two vnto doubtfull ſpeech or Equiuocation. Of which later point, hauing touched ſomewhat in the precedent Preface & being to haue occaſion to doe the ſame againe more largely afterward, wee ſhall now conſider principally of the former, concerning doctrine and practice of quiet or vnquiet, peaceable or dangerous humours & behauiours of ſubiects both Catholicke & Proteſtant.

About doctrine and practice of Rebellion. 7. And as for Catholickes, the Miniſter in all his eight reaſons bringeth out nothing of nouelty againſt vs, but only ſuch pointes of doctrine, as himſelfe doth confeſſe, and expreſly proue that they were held and receyued in our publique ſchooles, aboue foure hundred yeares gone: as namely in his firſt reaſon, *For that we hold Proteſtants for hereticks ſo farre forth as they decline and differ obſtinately from the receyued doctrine and ſenſe of the Roman Catholicke Church*, and conſequently that being Hereticks they are not true Chriſtians, nor can haue true faith in any one article of Chriſtian beliefe, and that the puniſhment determined by the ancient *Canon lawes*, which are many and grieuous, both ſpirituall & temporall, do, or may therby light vpon them. And in his ſecond, third and fourth reaſons, that wee teach,

2.3.4.

That

That the Bishop of Rome, as spirituall head of the vniuersall Church, hath power aboue temporall Princes, and may procure to let the Election and succession of such as are opposite, or enemies to Catholicke Religion, and that in some cases he may dissolue oathes of obediēce, and the like.

8. And further yet in his fifth, sixt, seauenth, and eight reasons, that in certaine occasions, and vpon certaine necessities, for preuenting of greater euils, imminent to any Countrey, Kingdome, or common wealth, especially if they be spirituall and appertaine to the saluation of soules, the same high Pastour may restraine, resist, or punish the enormous excesses of temporall Princes (if any such fall out) by Censures, excommunication, depriuation or deposition, though this not but vpon true, iust, and vrgent causes, when other means cannot preuaile, for auoiding those euerlasting euils. 5.6.7.8.

9. All which doctrines (for this is the summe of all he saith or alleadgeth) do cōteine, as yow see, no new matter of malice against Protestant Princes, inuented by vs, for that the Minister himselfe, as now we haue said, confesseth, *that for these three or foure later hundred yeares, these positions haue byn generally receiued by all the vniuersall Church and face of Christendome*; so as being estabilished so many hundred yeares before Protestants were borne or named in the world, they could not be made or inuented against them in particuler; but only are drawne vnto them at this time by the malicious application of this Minister, to make the diuorce before mencioned betweene our Prince and vs to seeme remediless. For if the doctrine approued and receyued so many ages before this difference of Religion was heard of, shall be laid vnto vs now for matter of vndutifulnes (with which doctrine notwithstanding our Aunceſtors liued most peaceably and dueti- An important consideratiō,

duetifully for many hundred yeares, as good ſubiectes vnder his Maieſties predeceſſours both in England & Scotland) what fault can this be in vs now, or what malicious folly is it in the Miniſter to obiect it againſt vs; yea to make a criminall accuſation therof in this his calumnious libell againſt all Catholikes of our Countrey whatſoeuer?

10. If we conſider their doctrines and poſitions, togeather with their practice and exercile concerning this point of quiet obedience and ſubiection, euen from theſe later times of *Luther*, *Zuinglius* and *Caluins* beginninges of innouation, we ſhall find an other manner of nouelty to contemplate, and another ſorte of dangers for Princes to tremble at. For if in ſteed of *Rebellious doctrine of the Romish Church* (which is the title of this aduerſaries pamphlet) wee ſhould ſet downe the poſitions and practice of the *Geneuian* Church and *Caluinian* ſect, planted and directed therby, we ſhould eaſely ſee what were the difference, as the whole world both may and doth. For that concerning their poſitions and doctrine that touch this point, they are extant in their owne bookes, not wronge or drawne by ſtrained inferences, as our Miniſters Calumniations are againſt Catholicks in this place, but plainely, cleerely, and Categorically ſet downe by their owne pen, teſtified and put in print by their owne writers, and eſpecially by one in England that is now in higheſt dignity vnder his Maieſty, and another in place of ſome dignity alſo by his office, who out of their owne bookes cited particulerly by them, relate theſe and other like poſitions: *That Princes may be reſtrained by force; purſued, iudged, and punished by the people; excommunicated, depriued, depoſed, and caſt into hell by the Miniſters; arraigned, condemned and put to death by the inferiour Magiſtrates, whenſoeuer in their opinion he becommeth a Tyrant, or oppoſite to*

Caluinian doctrine about obedience to Princes.

Archb. of Cant. in the first Booke of dangerous poſitions. cap. 4. & 5. and Sutclif. in the Suruey of pretended diſcipline.

ſite to the ghoſpell; which in effect falleth out to be ſo often as theſe head-ſtrong new brethren ſhall miſlike of his or her gouernement, & thinke them worthy to be remoued.

11. And if to the teſtimony of our Engliſh Proteſtant writers in this point, any be deſirous to haue adioined the ſuffrages in like manner of externe authors of the ſame Religion, concerning the ſame article, about the lawfulnes of violent vſage towardes Princes, in caſes by them preſcribed; let them read *Beza* himſelfe in his *Apology* to the Biſhop *Claudius de Sainctes* in defence and praiſe of *Pultrot* that murdered traiterouſly the famous great Duke of *Guiſe* his Maieſties great vncle, and ſupreme Generall of all the French forces; as alſo the diſcourſe of the French famous Miniſter *Surian* otherwiſe calling himſelfe *Roſier* in his Booke of Reaſons why it was lawfull for any of his *Hugonot* brethren to kill (as he ſaith) *Charles* the ninth King of *France* and his mother, if they would not obey the *Caluinian* Ghoſpell, as both *Launay*, *Belforeſt* & other French writers in their Hiſtories do relate. To which effect alſo was written that notorious and ſeditious booke intituled *Reueille matin*. and others by the brethren of the ghoſpell; yea aboue others, that moſt dangerous firebrand by *Orſinus Hotoman* and the reſt of *Geneua*, allowed alſo by *Beza*, intituled *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*: The reuenge vpõ Tyrantes conteyning a moſt ſhameles publique approbation of all deſperate, of all villanous attemptes whatſoeuer made, or to be made by their brethren, againſt lawfull Princes, vnder the name of Tyrantes, whenſoeuer it might ſeeme to be done in fauour of their ghoſpell.

Forraine vvriters of Proteſtantes pernicious doctrine againſt Princes.

Launay in Republique Chriſtienne. lib. 1. c. 9. 6 n. 1566. & Belfor. lib. 6 cap. 102. fol. 1565.

12. So as now after all this manifeſt aſſertiue doctrine of theirs, knowne and confeſſed in the world, and practiſed by them in ſo many places, for ſo many yeares, in ſo notorious manner, as no man can deny

deny it, for this Minister to come peeping forth with certaine poore illations & strained inferences against Catholiks, for that in certaine cases they acknowledge power to remaine in the head of the Church by way of *Canonicall* lawes and publique iudgment, to restraine exorbitant outragious excesses of Princes, when they shall fall out, is a ridiculous kind of byting at the heele, while the other do strike at the head: and so will it also appeare, if we obserue the euẽtes themselues, for that heere in this place our Minister (for example) mencioneth only foure factes or processes of Popes, to wit, two of *Gregories* the seauenth and ninth, and other two of *Pius* and *Sixtus* the fifth, who in so many ages haue giuen sentence of depriuation against Princes: wheras if we consider but this one age only, which hath passed since *Luther* began (and not yet one whole age) we shall find many more Princes deposed, slaine, molested, or violated by Protestant people, then by all Popes put togeather since the beginning of *Pope-dome* haue byn troubled or Censured, which is a markeable point, and not lightly to be passed ouer by prudent Princes: for that the reason herof is, that the one side proceedeth by lawe, publique iudgement, and mature deliberation, the other by popular mutiny, rash and temerarious precipitation. And this of doctrine in this place vntill we come to the fourth Chapter, where much more is to be added to this effect.

A markeable point.

Practice of the Protestant doctrine for tumultes against Princes.

13. But if we should come now from doctrine to action and examples of the exercise therof in this behalfe, there were no end of the narration, and there is no man or woman lightly of any yeares or vnderstanding in publique affaires, whose mind and memory is not full of them. For who remembreth not what passed in *Germany* presently almost vpon the beginning of *Luthers* doctrine (at the least not aboue 7. or 8.

or 8. yeares after) to wit, from the yeare 152.. teſtified aſwell by *Sleidan* and other Proteſtant Authors, as by thoſe that were Catholicke, how the new brethrē incited by this new doctrine againſt their Princes, both temporall and ſpirituall, tooke armes and entred into tumult and rebellion with ſuch violence and headlong pertinacy, throughout al that countrey, as in one Prouince only, there were aboue two hundred Monaſteries and Caſtels taken, razed, and ſpoiled, and aboue an hundred and thirty thouſand people ſlaine, & this was for that beginning: which fire once enkindled, and the humour of ſedition once ſetled in the heades o that Hereticall faction, neuer ceaſed afterward, but continued more or leſſe ſtill againſt the Emperour *Charles* the fifth, vnder diuers deuiſes and pretences of the *Smalcaldian* aſſociation, and the like, vntill more then twenty yeares after, to wit, vntill the yeare 1546. wherin he was forced to take in hand that great and dangerous warre (Luther himſelfe being yet aliue) againſt the Duke of *Saxonie*, Marques of *Brandeburge* and other Proteſtant Princes, whome he ſubdued therin, but not without great effuſion of Chriſtian bloud.

The Rebellions vpon Luthers doctrine.

The Smalcaldian aſſociatiō.

14. And the like I might relate of many other particuler States and principalities of *Germany*, as namely that of the Princes and Archbiſhops Electors of *Collen*, *Treuers* and *Mentz*, with all the State *Palatine* of *Rhene*, the Biſhoppricke and Dukedome of *Liege*, and other partes adioining, where togeather with this new Ghoſpell (eſpecially now deuided into different ſectes of Lutheraniſme, Zuinglianiſme, Caluiniſme, Anabaptiſme new Arrianiſme and the like) entred preſently new ſedition, Rebellion, and warres, and from thence diſperſed it ſelfe longe and wide, both North and South, Eaſt and Weſt. In the North, to *Saxony*, *Denmarke*, *Norway*, *Sweueland*, *Polonia*, *Tranſiluania*, North.

Multitudes of inſurrectiōs againſt true Princes by the newv Ghoſpel.

South. and other adioining countries; and on the ſouth to *Zwitzerland* firſt, *Sauoy*, *Griſons*, and other partes next adhering, where diuers battailes were fought, *Zuinglius* himſelfe being preſent as the chief ſtirrer in thoſe of the *Cantons* of *Zwitzerland* his countrey, and ſlaine therin, and *Caluin*, *Beza*, *Farellus*, and other ſuch Miniſters being the principall inciters in the Rebellions of *Geneua*, and neighbour countries, againſt the Duke of *Sauoy*, and other Lordes and Princes therof, as is apparant by their owne, and other mens bookes of the ſame part and faction.

In the East. 15. Towardes the Eaſt, the ſame fire of ſedition paſſed with the ſame new Proteſtant Ghoſpell, to *Bemeland*, *Auſtria*, *Hungary*, *Siletia*, *Moldauia* and other bordering Prouinces, where more or leſſe it hath continued till our time, wherin we ſee by lamẽtable experience, that they haue ioined euen with the Turke himſelfe againſt their Soueraigne Lord and Emperour, and againſt the Chriſtian name and cauſe, in deſpite of Catholicke Religion, as *Boſcaine*, the famous Caluinian Rebell, and others of that Religion, or irreligion rather in theſe partes, for ſome yeares now haue done; and finally haue forced the ſaid Emperour for auoiding the fatall ruine of Chriſtendome, to graunt him the Princedome of *Tranſiluania* during his life, which God for his ſo great wickednes hath ſoone cut of.

In the VVeſt. 16. But to the Weſt partes of the world, to wit, *France*, and all partes and parcels of that goodly Kingdome, the ſame fire was tranſported with greateſt fury of all, as doe teſtify their foure generall moſt bloudy warres, laſting for many yeares togeather, wherof if I ſhould recount but the leaſt particulers ſet downe by their owne hiſtories, it would rue any Chriſtian hart to heare or read the ſame.

France.

17. From hence if we draw neere homeward to *Flanders*,

Flanders, England and *Scotland*, the effectes of this new Ghospell and Ghospellers are yet more present vnto our eyes. For who can recount the thousandes of people, that vpon this occasion haue lost their liues both temporall and eternall as may be feared, in these long, & bloudy warres of the low countries, begunne first, and continued euer since, vpon the entrance of Protestant Religion in those States? Who can number the Cities beseiged, taken, rifled and ransacked? The townes and villages burnt and ouerthrowne? The countries spoiled? The people slaine and murdered about this difference? And if we looke into England, and the state but of one sole Catholicke Princes gouerning, there, but for foure or fiue yeares ouer Protestant subiectes misliking her gouernment for Religion, yow shall find more conspiracies, treasons, and Rebellions practised against her in proportion of so few yeares, by the said sorte of people (if we consider what *Northumberland, Suffolke, VViat, Courtney, Stafford, Fetherstone, VVilliam Thomas*, and others in different conspiracies practiced against her) then in more then 40. yeares was done against her Protestant sister by her Catholicke subiectes, though neuer so much afflicted, iniured and persecuted by her.

Flanders.

England.

18. But of all other countries, *Scotland* may be an example and president of Protestant spirites, what they are vnder a Catholike Prince or Princesse, though otherwise neuer so vertuous, or neuer so mild. For who can deny the exceeding great prudence, moderation, benignity, liberality, and other vertues of the Noble Queene *Mary* Regent of *Scotland*, Grandmother to our Soueraigne that now raigneth, when those furious and seditious Ministers *Knox, Goodman, Mollocke, Douglasse, Meffan*, and others began to raise vp her subiectes against her, from the yeare 1557. (which was the fourth of Queene *Maries* raigne of England)

Scotland.

See the Histories of Scotlād vvrittē by Bucchanā, and Knox and by Holinshed, and my Lord of Canr. his booke of dangerous Positions, cap. 2. 3. 4. &c.

and continued the same in most spitefull and barbarous manner, with intolerable insolency, both of wordes and actes, for 3. or 4. yeares togeather, assisted principally by the helpes, aide and encouragement of Queene *Elizabeth* (that had succeded in the Crowne of *England*) vntill through griefe, sorrow, and affliction, the excellent Princesse gaue vp the Ghost, vpō the yeare 1560. hauing byn first deposed, and the *lye* giuen her publickly, and most insolently by them. And finally seing herselfe so extreemely distressed and inuironed with these rebell forces, and with a puissant army sent from *England* in their succour, consumed and pyned away with affliction of mind as hath byn said: And no Christian could but haue compassion of her case. The particulers are written by *Knox* and *Buchanan* themselues, in their histories of *Scotland*, who were two chiefe firebrandes in that combustion, and by *Holinshed* an English Protestant Author in his description of *Scotland*, allowing well, and liking the same, according to the sense of English Protestantes who concurred with them both in good will and cooperation.

The afflictions and death of Q. Mary Regent of Scotland.

19. And thus much of the Queene Regent: but now of her excellent daughter, the Queene regnant, Mother of our Soueraigne, had they any greater respect vnto her notwithstanding all her benignity and benefites towardes them at her new returne out of *France*, when she pardoned all that was past, and accepted of new oathes and promises of faithfull obedience at their handes? did all this I say any thing auaile her or procure her safty or quietnes, in gouerning these new Ghospellers? No truly, so long as she remained Catholicke, that is, to her death, and after her death, they pursued her with the greatest hatred, and most barbarous cruelty, that euer perhaps was read of against Prince or Princesse before, or after her

The Protestantes proceeding against his Maiesties Mother.

her. I ſhall breifly heere ſet downe ſome few particularities of many, as I find them regiſtred both in Engliſh and Scottiſh Hiſtories themſelues, and that by Proteſtant writers, as hath byn ſaid.

20. This Noble Queene after long deliberation in *France*, what courſe to take in thoſe troubleſome times, when the ſpirit of the new Caluinian Ghoſpell had raiſed tumultes, conſpiracies, warres, and Rebellions throughout the moſt part of all States, Kingdomes, and Prouinces round about her, determined finally to credit the faire promiſes of her ſaid Proteſtant ſubiectes in *Scotland*, and to goe thither, which ſhe did, and arriued at *Lith* the 20. of Auguſt, vpon the yeare 1561. But before ſhe departed from *France*, there being ſent to her from the Catholicke party Doctor *Iohn Leſley* Biſhop of *Roſſe* to counſaile her not to truſt her baſtard-brother *Iames Steward* Prior of *S Andrewes*, that had byn the cheife Author of all the former broiles in *Scotland*, and was now ſent vnto her from the Proteſtant party to flatter and deceiue her with falſe oathes and Proteſtations, ſhe promiſed that ſhe would not: but he arriuing the next day after the Biſhop vnto her at *Rhemes* in France, made ſo great promiſes, oathes, and proteſtations vnto her, as by little and little gate credit with her; and ſo returned into *Scotland* by England (where he had his full inſtructions yow muſt thinke) to diſpoſe the mindes of all ſortes, to receiue, and obey the ſaid Queene after his and their faſhion and agreement; for which good office ſhe gaue him ſoone after her returne the Earledome of *Murrey*, and committed the cheife Gouernement of the Realme vnto him. But what effectes enſued, we ſhall now in few wordes declare.

A brief ſumme of matters fallen out in Scotland.

1561.

Holinsh. vbi ſupra.

Prior Iames made Earle of Murrey.

21. When vpon the yeare 1563. which was two yeares after her returne to *Scotland*, ſhe reſolued by conſent of her Parlament to marry her kniſman the

1563.

Lord *Darley*, newly made Earle of *Roſſe* and Duke of *Albany*, this Earle of *Murrey* made a leagne of his confederates againſt the ſame, pretending that it would be in preiudice of their Religion, and brake into open warres againſt them both, ſaith Holinſhed, and when they were preſſed by the Kinges and Queenes forces, they had alwaies their refuge into *England*, and their counſaile and direction both thence, and from their Miniſters that neuer parted from them, how to proſecute their matters againſt their Princes: wherof the firſt point was, to abuſe the yong Kinges credulity, and to ſet him againſt the Queene: and hence enſued that ſtrange and horrible act of entring her priuy chamber, when ſhe was at ſupper vpon the fourth
1566. of march 1566. in the company of the Earle of *Murton*, the Lordes *Ruthen* and *Lindſey*, all Proteſtantes, and armed, who ſaluted her firſt with this greeting, ſhe being great with child: *That they would no longer ſuffer her to haue the gouerning of the Realme, nor to abuſe them, as hitherto she had done*: And then pulled violently from her, her Secretary *Dauid*, which ſtood there preſent ſeruing her at table, and for his refuge tooke hold of her gowne, which they cut of, and ſlew him with many ſtabbes, to ſuch fright of the afflicted Queene, as it was no leſſe then a miracle, that ſhe had not periſhed therwith or miſcaried of her child (which was his Maieſty that now gouerneth *England*) hauing ſix monethes gone with the ſame. This was done at a Parlament when all the Proteſtant confederates met togeather, and tooke (as yow muſt thinke) the ghoſtly counſaile of their good Miniſters for ſo holy an enterpriſe. And vpon the 20. of Iune next, was the Prince borne, which thing not pleaſing ſome, that there ſhould remaine any yſſue of that family, which they deſired to extinguiſh, the ſaid King his Maieſties Father was moſt cruelly murthered in *Edenbrough* on

The barbarous murther of the Secretary Dauid.

The murther of the King.

the

the tenth of February next enſuing.

22. Nor did the matter ceaſe heere, but rather now aſcended to the greateſt height of malicious Treaſon which euer perhaps hath byn vſed againſt any crowned Prince in the world, for that theſe Lordes of the Congregatiõ, as they called themſelues, that is to ſay, Religious Rebels, congregated againſt their ſworne Prince, gathering forces togeather, laid violent handes on her Maieſties perſon firſt at *Carbar-hill* by *Edenbrough*, when confidently ſhe preſumed, as to her ſubiectes, to goe vnto them, and treate of peace, and then caſting her into priſon, depriued her of her Crowne, ſet vp againſt her the name of her deareſt iewell the yonge Prince, not yet a yeare old, made Regent her greateſt enemy the Earle of *Murrey* her baſtard traiterous brother, held Parlamentes, made lawes, debarred her the ſight of her ſonne for euer: and finally waging open warre againſt her, and ouerthrowing her forces in the feild, ſhe being preſent, forced her into *England*, and there following her alſo, procured vnto her the greateſt diſgraces, diſhonoured her with the fouleſt reportes, defamed her with the moſt ſpitefull ſermons, bookes and printed libelles; and finally oppreſſed her with the moſt notorious open iniuries, that euer were caſt vpon a perſon of her Maieſties quality & dignity. And all this without any ſcruple, or remorſe of conſcience at all: nay all was auerred to be done according to the very rule of the Ghoſpell & for the Ghoſpell, and this by all the Miniſters both of *Scotland* and *England*.

The barbarous dealing againſt his Maieſties Mother.

23. And thus much of the ſecond Queene *Mary* of *Scotland* brought to her ruine by the Euangelicall obedience of theſe new Ghoſpellers: but as for the yong Prince her Noble ſonne, whome ſhe loued moſt deareIy aboue all earthly creatures, and neuer was permitted ſo much as to embrace, or ſee him more afterward,

what

what passed in this time by the same sorte of mē, both during his minority and afterward, what cōtentions, what warres, what treasons, what murthers, what conspir cies, Rebellions and violences were vsed, were ouerlong to recount in this place: the Histories are full, and the collection made, and set forth in print by the foresaid Protestant Authour of *Daungerous Positions*, in his sixt Chapter and first booke against the *Puritanes* doth touch many essentiall pointes of diuers notorious iniuries, and violences offered by them and their Ministers, against the Kinges person, state, and dignity, as their taking his authority vpon them, his surpriz and restraint at *Rutheuen* vpon the yeare 1582. the brethrens allowing and authorizing the same afterward expressly against the Kinges declaration to the contrary.

What the King our Soueraigne hath suffered at Protestats handes in matters of disobedience & Rebelliō.

1582.

24. The conspiracy also against his person at *Striueling* vpon the yeare 1584. and many railing speaches, sermons and bookes against him and his gouernment made in England to disgrace him, and namely the seditious preaching of *Dauison* and other Scottish Ministers against him in *London*. in the Church of the *Old-Iury* and this being in the moneth of May, it followed in Nouember after that these Ministers with their complices returning into *Scotland* with aide from *England* (though this circumstance the Author concealeth as not making for his purpose) they gat ten thousand Rebelles togeather, and pitched their tentes before the towne of *Striueling*, whither the King was retired to fortify himselfe in the Castle, making proclamations in their owne names, and there draue at length his Maiesty to yeald his person into their handes, with the liues of his dearest friendes, and was depriued also by them of his old guard, and a new put vpon him. All which actes were not only defended afterward by the chiefe Ministers of that Realme, but

1584.

Intollerable insolencies of Ministers against the King.

the

the King himselfe was called in like manner *Ieroboam* by them, and threatned to be rooted out, as *Ieroboams* race was, if he continued in the course he held: and many other like insolences by them committed, which for breuityes sake I forbeare to recount in this place.

25. Now then to returne againe to our former ponderation set downe in the beginning of this Chapter, let euery sage and prudent Prince consider and weigh with himselfe, which of these two waies which of these two people, which of these two groundes of doctrine, which of these two methodes of practice, which of these two manners of spirit in *Protestant* & *Catholicke* subiectes doe best content him, and which of them he may thinke more sure or dangerous vnto him. For if we looke ouer the ancient recordes of our countries for a thousand yeares before, while English men were Catholicke, we shall not find so much violent and barbarous dealing with their Princes, as I haue heere recounted in lesse then thirty, within the compasse of one only Kingdome vnder the Protestantes.

A vveighty consideratiõ for Princes.

26. And if we compare the obiections made heere against vs by T. M. in this his calumnious pamphlet (as in the sequẽt Chapter more particulerly you shall see discussed) with these, and the like actions of their people; they are very trifles and streyninges in respect of these other. As for example *Doleman* is accused to write, that: *The common-wealth hath authority to choose to themselues a King* (when they haue none) *and to limit him lawes wherby they would be gouerned.* And that of Doctor *Stapleton*: *That the people* (or multitude) *was not made for the Princes sake, but the Prince for the people: That Religion is is to be had in consideration, in choice or admittance of a King, where choice and admittance is permitted: That the Pope being head of the Catholicke Church may in some cases, and for some*

Streyned infereneces against Catholickes.

causes dispense in oathes: That he may censure Princes vpon iust causes, though not in temporall matters but indirectly only, and vpon such necessity as no other remedy can be found for defence of the spirituall good of his subiectes: That euill Princes declyning into Tyranny may be repressed, but not by priuate men, or popular mutiny.

27. All these pointes (I say) and diuers others, which this fellow doth so greatly exaggerate and odiously amplify against vs, are so ouerrunne by them both in doctrine and practice, if we compare them, as they scarse admit any comparison at all, especially if we cast our eyes vpon their present practice, which representeth the liuely fruite of their doctrine: as namely, the most dangerous Rebellions of *Caluinian* and *Trinitarian* Sectaries, euen now standing on foote in *Hungary Austria*, and *Transiluania* against the Emperour: and of like men in *Polonia* against that mild and most iust King: and of *Lutherans* in *Suetia*, of *Puritanes*, *Brownists*, *Protestantes*, and the like in the Low-countries, so many yeares now continued against their true and natural Prince as before hath byn declared; which maketh another manner of impression and force of consequence, if it be well pondered, then doth the particuler temerarious fact of halfe a score of yong Gentlemen put in despaire by apprehension of publique persecution, without demerit of the persecuted, or hope of remedy for the same, though this also be inexcusable; but the difference of euils, is worthy of consideration, especially with the more graue and prudent sort of people, that are not carried away with pasion, or otherwise misled by sinister information.

The comparison betweene the disobedience of Catholicks and Protestats.

28. And thus hauing said sufficiently in generall about the first and chiefe ground of our Ministers calumniation, concerning Rebellion and Conspiracies, wherby he would make impossible the cohabitation, and mutuall vnion of Catholicke subiectes with

with Proteſtantes, we ſhall paſſe on to his ſecond pillar of impugnation, named by him The doctrine of *Equiuocation*: but yet firſt we thinke it expedient to examine in a ſeuerall Chapter the particuler reaſons which he hath framed for ſome ſhew of proofe to this his ſeditious aſſertion.

TEN REASONS

OR RATHER

CALVMNIATIONS

BROVGHT BY T. M.

For maintenance of his former Propoſition:

That Catholicke people are intolerable in a Proteſtant gouernment in reſpect of diſloyalty, conſpiracies and Rebellion,

Confuted and returned vpon himſelf and his.

CHAP. II.

ALbeit thatwhich we haue laid forth before in the precedent Chapter, for the ouerthrow of the ſlanderous & iniurious imputations of our aduerſary, about Rebellion and conſpiracies, be ſufficient (I doubt not) for ſatisfaction of any indifferent and diſpaſsionate minde, that is not ouerborne with preiudice; yet haue I thought it expedient to paſſe ſomewhat

what further alſo, and to enter the liſt with him for improuing his particuler reaſons, on which he would ſeene to found his calumniations, wherin as nothing is ſo abſurd or falſe (according to the Oratours opinion) but that by ſpeech and ſmooth diſcourſe it may be made in ſome eares probable, at leaſtwiſe in the conceipt of him that ſpeaketh and indeauoreth to deceaue another: ſo this Miniſter T. M. (for of that trade he is held now to be) hauing deſigned to himſelf an argumẽt wherby to make Catholickes odious, and gathered togeather for that end diuers ſhewes or ſhadowes for the furniture of his forſaid found aſſertion, that Catholickes are not tolerable in a Proteſtant State, he intituleth them: *Pregnant obſeruations directly prouing Romish ſchooles to be Seminaries of Rebellion in all Proteſtantes gouernment*: Wheras indeed they are not ſo much *pregnant obſeruations*, as *malignant collections and inforced inferences vpon falſe groundes*. Neither do they at all either directly or indirectly proue that which he pretendeth, as by examination ſhall preſently appeare, if it may pleaſe the Reader to hold an equall and indifferent eare in the meane ſpace to the diſcuſſing of the controuerſy.

2. And firſt of all to make vp a competent number in forme of a decalogue, he ſtreineth himſelf much to bring out ten different reaſons, and in deed euery man may ſee that it is a ſtreine, for that all might haue byn vttered in two or three at the moſt, if not in fewer; for that all doe concerne in effect the Catholike doctrine, about the Popes authority either in Princes or priuate mens affaires. And herehence is deduced his firſt reaſon concerning the cenſures and puniſhments determined by Eccleſiaſticall Canons againſt them that by the Church are denounced for Heretickes. The ſecond reaſon toucheth the ſaid Popes authority ſpirituall ouer ſecular Princes. The third, the hin-

A decalogue of T. M. his reaſons hardly ſtreined

1.

2.

3.

derance of their succesion by the same lawes. The
4. fourth, the oath and obedience of their subiectes.
5. The fifth, their excommunication and deposition.
6. The sixth the practice of their death by the Popes
7. licence. The seauenth, the allowance and approba-
8. tion therof. The eight the Rebellion of Priestes
9. whensoeuer they are able. The ninth the dissoluing and euacuation of oathes by the Popes authority.
10. The last that Romish Priestes by the order of the Pope must professe seditious positions *ex officio*, that is to say, as he is a Romish Priest. By which enumeration yow may see in deed, that the poore man was more barren then pregnant, and after his streine had *partum difficilem*, a hard child-birth, as may appeare by that which he hath brought forth, to wit a mouse for a mountaine, and therupon we may iustly say: *parturiunt montes* &c. We shall giue a short view ouer all his reasons.

The first Reason. §. 1.

" THey who by their slanderous doctrine (saith he)
" doe make all Protestants by their common cen-
" sure Heretickes, so odious, as vnworthy of any ciuill
" or naturall society, must necessarily be iudged sedi-
" tious & intolerable amongst the Protestants: But the
" Romish Seminaries and Iesuites doe so, *ergo*. This is his reason and manner of reasoning, and in this sorte goe all the rest, ech thing with his *ergo*, that yow may know that the learned man hath studied Logicke, or rather sophistry to set downe all in forme of syllogisme. And to proue his propositions or premisses in this first argument he vseth two meanes, first to cite the hard speeches of certaine Catholicke writers a-

How T. M. proueth his assertions.

gainst

gainſt the Caluinian faith, as though it were none at all, but rather infidelity: (wherin we ſhall ſee after what great ſtore of Proteſtant writers they haue alſo with them in that point) the other *medium* is a certeine odious enumeration of the penalties inflicted by Church-lawes, and Canons of old time vpon hereſy and Hereticks in generall; all which T. M. will needes apply to himſelf and to Engliſh Proteſtantes at this day, to breake therby all ciuill aſſociation with vs that are Catholickes: but both the one and the other are proofes of no validity. Let vs begin with the firſt.

4. He citeth the wordes of *Andreas Iurgiuicius* Canon of *Cracouia* in *Polonia*, affirming that Proteſtantes doe holde *no one article of the Apoſtles Creed*, to wit, rightly and entierly. Of M. *VVright* in his articles, teaching Proteſtantes *to haue no faith, no Religion, no Chriſt.* Of M. *Reynoldes*, entituling his booke *Caluino-Turciſmus.* Of *D. Gifford* in the preface to the ſaid booke, auouching the pretented now Ghoſpel of *Caluin*, in many things, *to be worſe and more wicked then the Turkes Alcaron.* And finally of *Antonius Poſſeuinus* who wrote a booke *De Atheiſmis Proteſtantium*: Of the Atheiſmes, or pointes of doctrine leading to Atheiſme, which are taught by diuers Proteſtants, eſpecially by *Caluin*, and his followers.

Iurginicius.
M. VVright.
M Reinoldes.
D. Gifford
Poſſeuinus.

5. Out of all which ſpeeches T. M. inferreth the generall meaning of vs Catholicks to be: *That all humane ſociety with Proteſtantes muſt be vtterly diſſolued*, which is vtterly falſe and a meere miſtaking. For theſe ſpeeches proue only that there cā be no ſociety betweene Catholickes and Proteſtants in their doctrine & beliefe, but not in life, manners & conuerſation, which is the point in queſtion: ſo as T. M. inferreth here *quid pro quo.* And if he will heare one of his owne brethren hold this poſition alſo; *That there can be no vnion, ſociety, or con-*

No ſociability in doctrine but in cõuerſation there may be. *Perkins Catholick*

or conformity betweene their & our doctrine pretended by ſome, let him read *VVilliam Perkins* epiſtle to *S. VVilliam Bowes* in the preface of his reformed or rather deformed Catholicke, where he reprehendeth the new brethren of *France*, and ſome alſo in *England*, for giuing hope of this vnion. So as in this point we agree, that no agreement can be in Religion, but in conuerſatiõ there may, as we haue ſhewed by many examples in the precedent Chapter of people of different Religion that liue togeather at this day in vnion of obedience, and quiet ſubiection vnder the *Perſian*, *Turke*, and Chriſtian Emperour, as alſo vnder the great Kings of *France*, *Polonia* and other Princes. Fondly then doth T. M. inferre the incompoſsibility of cohabitation & conuerſation out of the inſociability of their doctrine and Religion.

The harde ſpeeches againſt Caluiniſtes anſwered.

6. Now as for the hard and harſh ſpeeches of the Authors alleadged, though vnto many they may ſeeme ſomewhat ſharpe exaggerations; yet vnto him that ſhall conſider well the matter in hand, and the accuſtomed phraſes of ancient Fathers in like occaſions, it will appeare far otherwiſe. For firſt *Iurgiuicius* his meaning is nothing elſe, as appeareth by his booke, but that in all and euery article of the Creed, Caluiniſtes haue innouated and altered ſomewhat in the true ſenſe therof, and added particuler errours of their owne, as yow ſhall heare afterward proued, and declared more largely out of the writings and aſſertions of diuers great Lutheran Proteſtants, that hold *Caluiniſts* to haue peruerted all the articles of the ſaid Creed. Of which point our learned countriman *M. VVilliam Reinoldes*, that had byn diuers yeares a Proteſtant and Preacher of that doctrine, after long ſtudy to proue the ſame by many demonſtrations, reſolued to write a whole booke, *That Caluiniſtes belieue no one article of the Apoſtles Creed*; but afterwardes turned

the

the ſame into that other worke entituled *Caluino-Turciſmus*, which is held by ſtrangers to be one of the moſt learned, that hath byn written of this kinde of controuerſy in our age, and *M. Sutcliffe* hath made himſelf ridiculous by attempting to anſwere the ſame.

Caluino-Turciſmus of M. Reinoldes.

7. Thoſe wordes alſo of *M. VVright* (if he vſed them) that Hereticks haue *no faith, no Religion, no Chriſt, but are meere infideles*, doe conteine an ancient poſition of Catholicke doctrine, deliuered in ſchooles and Fathers writings againſt old Heretickes, many hundred yeares before the name of Proteſtantes was heard of in the world; ſo that this cannot be of malice properly againſt them. The famous doctor *S. Thomas* aboue three hundred yeares gone, hath this Queſtion in his Treatiſe of faith: Whether he *that erreth obſtinatly in one point, or article of his beliefe, doth leeſe his whole faith in all the reſt*, and holdeth *yea*; alleadging for the ſame inuincible reaſons. And the ſame Doctor in like manner propoſeth another queſtion, to wit, which of three ſinnes belonging to infidelity is moſt grieuous, *Iudaiſme*, *Paganiſme* or *Hereſy*? & reſolueth the queſtion thus: That albeit in ſome reſpects the former two may be thought more grieuous in that they deny more points of faith; yet abſolutely in regarde of the malice and obſtinacy of an Hereticke, that knew once the Catholicke truth, and now wilfully impugneth the ſame, againſt the iudgement of the vniuerſall viſible Church, his ſinne and damnation is much more grieuous; and hereupon the ancient * Fathers doe euery where aggrauate the heynouſnes of this ſinne aboue all other ſinnes, and in particuler, *doe deny them to be Chriſtians, but rather to be Infideles, and worſe then Infideles*, as now by *S. Thomas* hath byn ſaid: which is moſt conforme to the writinges of the Apoſtles themſelues and Apoſtolicke men, who deteſted this ſinne in the higheſt degree, as might largely be ſhewed

Maiſter VVrights ſpeeches.

D. Thomas 2.2. quaſt. 5. art. 3.

Ibidem quæſt. 10. art. 6.

Hovv heinous a ſinne hereſy is.

** See Tertull. li. de pudicitia. Cypr. li. 4. ep. 2. Athan. ſer. 2 contr. Arrian. Aug. li. de gratia. Hier. con. Lucifer. &c.*

wed out of their workes, euen to the horror of the Reader, if this place did beare it. That ſeuere ſpeach of *S. Paul* may be ſufficient for all the reſt, exhorting his diſciple *Titus* to *auoide an hereticall man after one or two reprehenſions, knowing that ſuch a one is ſubuerted, and ſinneth as damned by his owne iudgment.* Which is neuer found written of other ſortes of Infideles.

Tit. 3.

8. No man then ought to be offended with theſe earneſt and ſharpe ſpeeches, where hereſy or the preſumption therof is in queſtion, for that nothing is more dreadfull to Catholicke people then the very name and apprehenſion of hereſy; howſoeuer in our vnfortunate daies, it be made a matter of diſpute only, or table-talke by many now in *England*, and he that will ſee ſtore of proofes and reaſons laied togeather by the foreſaid learned man *M. Reynoldes* to proue that the hereſies of theſe our times, of ſuch as call themſelues *Proteſtants*, but eſpecially the followers of *Caluin*, are farre more perillous and deteſtable then Paganiſme, Iudaiſme or Turciſme, let him read not only his foreſaid fower bookes *De Caluino-Turciſmo*, but two ſpeciall large Chapters or Treatiſes of this very matter in his booke *De iuſta Reipublicæ poteſtate &c.* to wit the 4. and 5. and he will reſt ſatisfied.

M. Reinoldes collection about moderne hereſies.

9. Nor doe Catholicke writers only make theſe Proteſtations againſt *Caluin* and his doctrine, but many of the moſt learnedeſt other Proteſtants of theſe daies, as hath byn touched. One moſt famous preacher and Proteſtant writer or rather Superintendent in *Polonia* called *Francis Stancarus* in an epiſtle to the King himſelf ſaith of him, and to him: *Quis Diabolus te, ô Caluine, ſeduxit, vt contra filium Dei cum Arrio obloquaris? &c. Cauete, o vos Miniſtri omnes, a libris Caluini, præſertim in articulis de Trinitate, incarnatione, mediatore, Sacramento Baptiſmi, & prædeſtinatione: continent enim doctrinam impiam & blaſphemias Arrianas:* What deuill hath ſeduced thee, o Caluin,

Franciſcus Stancarus Miniſter ep. ad Regem Poloniæ.

Caluin, that thou ſhouldeſt ſpeake iniuriouſly againſt the ſonne of God with *Arrius* the Hereticke? &c. Beware, all yee Miniſters, of *Caluins* bookes, eſpecially in the articles of the Bl. Trinity, Incarnation, of the mediator, of the Sacrament of Baptiſme, and of predeſtination: for they conteine impious doctrine, and blaſphemies of *Arrius*.

10. Another brother and Proteſtant-Preacher no leſſe zealous then he in *Germany* named *Conradus Schluſſelburge* ſaith of him & his followers that himſelf hath declared & proued in three large books: *Hos de nullo ferè Chriſtianæ doctrinæ articulo rectè ſentire:* That they ſcarcely belieue aright any one article of Chriſtian beliefe, which is the ſelf ſame that the forenamed Catholicke writer *Iurgiuicius* obiected before, which T. M. tooke ſo impatiently as yow haue heard. And the ſame brother in one of his ſaid bookes affirmeth: *Quod Caluiniſtæ ipſum filium Dei mendacij arguunt, Deum ſua omnipotentia ſpoliant, ſunt abiurati hoſtes & profligatiſſimi falſatores Teſtamenti filij Dei:* That Caluiniſts doe charge the Sonne of God with a ly, doe ſpoile God of his omnipotency, and are foreſworne enemies, and moſt wicked falſifiers of the Teſtament of the Sonne of God.

Conradus Schluſſelburgius in l. de Theologia Caluiniſtarũ impreſſ. Francof. 1592. l. 2. art. 13.

11. And another famous Doctor of the ſame new Ghoſpell and ſpirit, ſaith that this ſect of *Caluiniſts* & their doctrine, *Sentina quædam eſt &c. is a certeine ſinke into which all other hereſies doe flow: it is the laſt rage of the diuell, which he in his fury doth exerciſe againſt Chriſt and his Church &c.* And then further: *Qui partes eorum ſequitur &c. he that followeth their ſect, is a manifeſt and ſworne enemy of God, and hath denied his faith which he promiſed to Chriſt in his baptiſme:* So he. And conſider now whether this be not as great deteſtation of *Caluins* doctrine, by principal learned Proteſtants, as T. M. hath picked out of Catholicks wreſted wordes before recited?

Io Schultz. lib. de 50. cauſis lit. A. 6. lit. Q. 3.

12. But yow muſt not thinke that heere is an end,

for there would be no end, if I ſhould proſecute all that might be ſaid in this caſe: *Tilmannus Heshuſius* a Superintendent of the Proteſtants in the ſame countrey calleth Caluins doctrine: *Blaſphemam & Sacrilegam ſectam*; a blaſpemous and Sacrilegious ſect: and writeth a ſpeciall booke of this title: *A defence of the Holy Teſtament of Chriſt againſt the blaſphemous confeſſion of Caluiniſts.* And *AEgidius Hunnius* writing a booke *De Caluino Iudaizante*, of Caluin playing the Iew, after a long confutation ſaith thus: *Detectum ſatis ſuperq; iudico &c.* we haue detected I ſuppoſe ſufficiently, and more then ſufficiently that Angell of darkenes *Iohn Caluin*, who comming forth of the pit of hell, hath partly by his deteſtable wickednes in wreſting Scriptures, partly by his impious pen againſt the Holy Maieſty of Chriſt, partly by his horrible and monſtrous paradoxes about predeſtination, drawne both himſelf into hell, & a great number of ſtarres, as the Apocalips ſpeaketh.

Tilmannus Heshuſius

AEgidius Hunnius. fol. 181.

Apo. 12.

13. I pretermit many others, as that of *Philippus Nicolaus* a Proteſtant-Miniſter of *Tubinga*, who in the yeare 1586. ſet forth a booke in 4. with this title: *A Diſcouery* (and this I write for our diſcouerer) *of the fundaments of the Caluinian Sect, and how they agree with old Arrians and Neſtorians*: Wherby alſo is demonſtrated that no Chriſtian man can take part with them, but that he muſt defend Arrianiſme and Neſtorianiſme: So he. But the next yeare after there came another booke forth printed in the ſame Vniuerſity with this title: *A demonſtration out of the Holy Scriptures, that Caluiniſts and Sacramentaries are not Chriſtians, but rather baptized Iewes and Mahometanes*: and a little after that againe came forth the booke of *Ioannes Matthias* the great Preacher in *VVittenberge*: *De cauendo Caluiniſtarum fermento*, how to auoid the leauen of the Caluiniſts; and then another of *Albertus Grauerus* of like function vpon the yeare 1598. entituled: *Bellū Ioannis Caluini & Ieſu Chriſti*:

Many bookes of the learneder Proteſtantes againſt Caluiniſtes.

Ioannes Modeſtus. 1587.

Ioannes Matthias.

Albertus Grauerus

The

The warre betweene *Iohn Caluin* and *Ieſus Chriſt*; and al this written, ſet forth, and printed by chiefe Proteſtant brethren: which if the inference of T. M. be true againſt Catholickes, that in reſpect of the difference of their doctrine, and for that they holde Caluiniſts to haue no true faith, they may not liue togeather vnder one Prince: then muſt it follow alſo that neither theſe *Lutherans* and *Caluinian* Proteſtants can liue togeather: and the very ſame enſueth betweene Engliſh Proteſtants & Puritanes, vpon the difference of their doctrine and belief, which hath no leſſe oppoſition in deed and deteſtation the one of the other in bitternes of ſpeach, then haue the Lutherane Proteſtants againſt them both; as may eaſily be demonſtrated out of their owne bookes, if we would ſtand vpon it. And this ſhall be ſufficient for the refutation of his firſt *medium*, brought forth to proue that Catholicks and Proteſtants cannot liue togeather in one common wealth, for that the one ſide accompteth the other for Hereticks.

14. But the ſecond *medium* is yet more childiſh, which is, that for ſo much as we not only doe hold Proteſtants to be excommunicate Hereticks, but ſubiect alſo to all the puniſhments & penalties ſet downe in the Popes Eccleſiaſticall Canons, Decrees, & Conſtitutions for the ſame, which are many and grieuous, (as that Hereticks muſt leeſe their goods, cannot gather vp tythes, nor recouer debtes, nor inſtitute heires, and other ſuch like, and more ſharpe penalties preſcribed in old time by the Canon law againſt ancient Hereticks) herof he inferreth that we detract all humane ſociety from Proteſtants, and conſequently we are not tolerable in a Proteſtant common-wealth. Refutatiõ of his ſecond medium.

15. But we anſwere firſt, that touching the former part to wit the imputation of hereſy and excommunication to the Proteſtant party of *England*, that follo-

weth the Sacramentary doctrine of *Caluin* and *Zuinglius*, yow haue heard now immediatly before, how that imputation is laid vpon them, not only by Catholickes, but alſo by the moſt renowned Proteſtant writers that haue byn ſince that name and profeſsion began. And if we would alleadge much more out of the very Father of Proteſtancy it ſelf *Martin Luther*, we might haue ſtore, eſpecially where he pronoũceth this iudiciall ſentence of them all: *Hæreticos ſeriò cenſemus & alienos ab Eccleſia Dei Zuinglianos & Sacramentarios omnes, qui negant Chriſti corpus & ſanguinem ore carnali ſumi in venerabili Sacramento.* We doe vnfeynedly hold for Heretickes, and for aliens from the Church of God all Zuinglians and other Sacramentaries that doe deny Chriſtes body and bloud to be receaued by our bodily mouth in the venerable Sacrament.

Luther. contr. art. Louanien. Theſ. 27.

16. Behold heere both Hereſy and excommunication or ſeparation from the Church of God auerred againſt both Zuinglians and Caluiniſts, by him that was their chiefeſt parent and Patriarch: and in other places of his workes, the ſame *Luther* hath many more particulers to this purpoſe, as namely that men muſt fly the bookes and doctrine of *Zuinglius* and his followers, *Non ſecus ac tartarei Dæmonis venenum*, no otherwiſe then the poiſon of the diuell of hell. And yet further that: *They are not to be held in the number of Chriſtians, for that they teach no one article of Chriſtian doctrine without corruption, and are ſeauen times worſe then Papiſts &c.* Wherby is euident that this charge of Hereſy and excommunication proceedeth not againſt Caluiniſts from vs only, but much more eagerly frõ their owne brethren, & conſequently it is with very little diſcretion brought in by the Miniſter T. M. againſt vs as a ſinguler fault of ours, wherof we are to treat more afterward in ſome occaſions that will be offered.

Luther. de cæna Do. tomo 2. Ger. f. 182 & 190.

17. But now as for the penalties conteyned in the

Canon

Canon law, againſt excommunicate Heretickes, as depriuation of dignities, loſſe of goods, infamy, impriſonment, debarment from Sacraments, and from conuerſation, with the like; the anſwere is ſoone made, that thoſe externall puniſhments are not incurred ordinarily, but after perſonall denunciation and condemnation by name. For albeit the inward puniſhmentes that follow Hereſy which are ſinne and depriuation of grace, excommunication and ſeparation from Gods true Church, and other ſpirituall loſſes theron depending, be incurred by the obſtinate holding or defending of any cõdemned Hereſy whatſoeuer, if the defender know the ſame to be condemned by the Church, as both Holy Canons doe expreſſly denounce, and *Bulla Cænæ Domini* euery yeare renewed on *Maundy-Thurſday* doth confirme: yet commonly are they not held for ſubiect to the other externall puniſhmentes (and in particuler to be auoided and their company fled) vntill by a lawfull Iudge he or they be denounced, conuicted, and condemned by name, which we aſcribe not to the Proteſtantes of England, and therfore this charge was maliciouſly deuiſed by this Miniſter againſt vs, to make vs odious.

Concerning the penalties incurred by Hereſy according to the Canons.

18. Nay we goe yet further for pacifying & milding matters betweene vs, that we doe not eaſily cõdemne or hold all and euery ſorte of Proteſtantes, Puritanes, or the like ſortes different at this day in our countrey from the Catholicks, for abſolute Heretickes, but excuſing them rather wherin we may by any charitable interpretation, doe willingly lay hands where probably we may on that wiſe, learned, and diſcreet moderation of the famous doctor *S. Auguſtine*, affirming to his friend *Honoratus* infected with the *Manichean* Hereſy, that there is a great difference betweene an Hereticke, and one that belieueth Hereticks, and is deceaued by them; yow ſhall heare his owne wordes to that

The moderation of S. Auguſtine vvillingly admitted.

Aug. lib. de vtilitate credendi ad Honoratum Manichæum.

that purpoſe: *Si mihi (Honorate) vnum atque idem videretur eſſe Hæreticus & Hæreticis credens homo, tam lingua, quàm ſtylo in hac cauſa conquieſcendum eſſe arbitrarer: nunc verò cùm inter duo plurimùm interſit &c.*

19. If it had ſeemed to me (friend Honoratus) that an Hereticke & a man belieuing Hereticks had byn al one thing, I ſhould haue thought it better to hold my peace in this cauſe betweene vs, rather then to ſpeake or write any thing therin: but now ſeeing there is ſuch great difference betweene theſe two, I thought it not good to be ſilent with yow, for ſo much as an Hereticke in my opinion is he, that for ſome temporall reſpect or commodity, but eſpecially for vaine glory and ſingularity, doth inuent, or follow falſe and new opinions: but he which belieueth ſuch people is a man only deluded by a falſe imagination of truth & piety. So *S. Auguſtine.* And hereby openeth to vs a dore to thinke charitably of many Proteſtants, whome though we hold for deceaued; yet not properly in *S. Auguſtines* meaning for Hereticks.

VVho is an Hereticke.

20. And this doctrine teacheth the ſame Doctor in other places againſt the *Donatiſtes*, ſaying, that if a man ſhould beleeue the hereſy of *Photinus* (for example) who denied the diſtinction of three perſons in God, and the diuinity of Chriſt, and ſhould thinke it were the true Catholicke faith: *Iſtum nondum Hæreticum dico* (ſaith S. Auguſtine) *niſi manifeſtata ſibi doctrina Catholicæ fidei reſiſtere maluerit, & illud quod tenebat elegerit.* I doe not thinke this man as yet to be an Hereticke, except when the doctrine of the Catholicke faith (to wit that which is held generally by all or the moſt Churches ouer Chriſtendome) being made cleere and manifeſt vnto him, he ſhall reſolue to reſiſt the ſame, and ſhall make *choice* of that which before he held: ſo as now this *choice* or *election* with obſtinate reſolution to hold and defend the ſame againſt the publicke

lib. 4. de bap. contra Donatiſtas c. 16.

Euery one that belieueth hereſy is not properly an Hereticke.

Choice or election make Hereſy.

blicke authority of the Church, maketh that to be properly hereſy, which before was but error; which error though it might be in it ſelf damnable; yet nothing ſo much as when it paſſeth into the nature of hereſy; both which pointes are ſeene by that which the ſaid Holy Father hath in another place, to wit in his booke *De hæreſibus ad Quod-vult-Deum*, where hauing recounted eighty and eight Hereſies, that had paſſed before his time vnto the *Pelagians*, that were the laſt, he concludeth thus: *There may be yet other Hereſies beſides theſe that I haue in this our worke recounted, or there may riſe vp other hereafter, whereof whoſoeuer shall holde any one, he shall not be a Chriſtian Catholicke.* He doth not ſay he ſhall be an Hereticke properly, but no Chriſtian Catholicke, which though it be ſufficient to damnation, if ignorance excuſe him not; yet nothing ſo great as if he were an hereticke, for that as before we haue ſhewed out of *S. Thomas*, the damnation of Iewes and Gentiles is much more tolerable then that of Heretickes.

21. And all theſe limitations and charitable moderations we doe willingly vſe to calme and mitigate matters, and to temper that intemperate breaking humour of this make-bate Miniſter T. M. and his companions that would put all in combuſtion and deſperate conuulſion. And ſo much of this firſt reaſon, the reſt we ſhall paſſe ouer with greater breuity.

To his ſecond and third Reaſons. §. 2.

HIs ſecond reaſon why his Maieſties Catholicke and Proteſtant ſubiects may not liue togeather in *England* is, *For that all Popish Prieſtes* (ſaith he) *doe attribute a double prerogatiue ouer Kings, that is to ſay, a Democraticall*

and Monarchicall Soueraigne ciuill power, the firſt to the people, the ſecond to the Pope: And for proofe of the firſt, concerning the people, he alleadgeth fower ſeuerall authorities of Catholicke writers, but ſo corruptly and perfidiouſly, as if nothing elſe did ſhew his talent of cogging and treacherous dealing, this were ſufficient to diſcouer the ſame, though afterwardes greater ſtore will occurre: we ſhall runne ouer briefly all theſe fower.

23. Firſt he ſaith that *Doleman* in his Conference about ſucceſsion hath theſe wordes: *The Common-wealth hath authority to chuſe a King, and to limit him lawes at their pleaſure:* Which if it were truly alleadged as it lieth in the Author, yet heere is no mention *of the people*, or of *Democraticall ſtate*, but only of the Common-wealth, which includeth both nobility and people, and all other ſtates. Secondly *Dolemans* wordes are not of chuſing a King, but of chuſing a forme of gouernement be it *Democraticall*, *Ariſtocraticall* or *Monarchicall*. Let vs heare the Author himſelf ſpeake: In like manner (ſaith he) it is euident, that as the Common-wealth hath this authority to chuſe and change her gouernement (as hath byn proued:) ſo hath it alſo to limit the ſame with what lawes and conditions ſhee pleaſeth, wherof enſueth great diuerſity of authority and power, which ech one of the former gouernments hath in it ſelf. So he. Where we ſee that *Doleman* ſpeaketh of the power which a Common-wealth hath, that is deuoid of any certeine gouernement, to chuſe vnto themſelues that forme that beſt liketh them, with the limitations they thinke moſt expedient: and ſo we ſee in *England*, *France*, *Polonia*, *Germany*, *Venice*, *Genua*, and in the Empire it ſelf different formes and manners of gouernement, with different lawes and limitations, according to the choice and liking of ech nation. This place then of *Doleman* is corrupted by T. M. both in wordes

Dol. par. 1 pag. 13. cyted in Diſcouery pag. 9.

» » » » » » » »

Dolemãs text abuſed in vvordes & ſenſe.

wordes and sense, for he neither speaketh nor meaneth as the false Minister auoucheth him, of giuing *Democraticall* power to the people ouer Princes established.

24. There followeth the second place taken out of the French Iesuite, as he calleth him: *De iusta abdicatione &c.* though it be well knowne that *D. Bouchier* Author of that booke yet liuing in Flanders, and Canon of *Tourney* was neuer Iesuite in his life; but all must be ascribed to Iesuits, that may seeme odious: *This French Iesuite (saith he) sheweth a reason of Dolemans speach, saying: For Maiesty is rather seated in the Kingdome, then in the King.* But I would aske the poore man, why he doth alleadge this place? or of what weight it is, or may be for his purpose? for so much as *D. Bouchier* in these wordes denieth not Maiesty to be in the King, but to be more in the Kingdome; for that the Kingdome giueth Maiesty vnto the King when it chuseth him, and not the King properly vnto the Kingdome. And is not this a great obiection? or doth this proue that we ascribe *Democraticall* soueraignity ouer Kings vnto the people? One of his owne Ghospell-brethren speaketh more roundly and roughly to the matter when he writeth: *Populo ius est vt imperium cui velit deferat:* The people hath right to bestowe the crowne vpon whome they list: if we had said so, what aduantage would T. M. haue sought thereat?

D. Bouchier p. 36. cyted in Disc. pa. 8.

His cauillation against D. Bouchier.

Buchan. l. de iure regni. p. 13

25. His third place is out of *D. Stapleton*, in his booke called *Dydimus*, where he saith: That the people are not ordeyned for the Prince, but the Prince for the people. His wordes in Latin are: *Non populi in Principum gratiam facti, sed Principes in populi commodum creati sunt.* Multitudes of people are not made (by God) for Princes sakes, but Princes are created for the commodity or good of the people: and what is there in this sentence iustly to be reprehended? Is not this euident

Stapleton in Dydimo pa. 261 cyted in Disc. pa. 8.

Peeuish vvrāgling against D. Stapletō.

by diuine and humane lawe, and by the very light of nature it ſelf, that Princes were firſt ordeined by God, for the good of multitudes, and not multitudes for the vtility of Princes? Will T. M. deny this? or is not this far more modeſt and temperate then that of his owne brethren before mentioned, whoſe wordes are: *Populus Rege eſt præſtantior & melior*; the people are better & more excellēt then the King? what wilfull wrangling is this in a turbulent Miniſter?

Buchanan li. de iure regnip. 61

26. His fourth and laſt place is out of *M. VVilliam Reinoldes* in his booke *De iuſta Reip. auctoritate &c.* whome he abuſeth egregiouſly, both in aſcribing to him that which is not his, and in deliuering the ſame corruptedly, and by a little yow may learne much, *ex vngue leonem*. His wordes he citeth thus: *Rex humana creatura eſt, quia ab hominibus conſtituta*: and Engliſheth in this manner: *A King is but a creature of mans creation*. where yow ſee firſt that in the tranſlation he addeth *but*, and *mans creation* of himſelf, for that the Latin hath no ſuch *but*, nor *creation*, but *conſtitution*. Secondly theſe wordes are not the wordes of *M. Reinoldes*, but only cited by him out of *S. Peter*; and thirdly they are alleadged here by T. M. to a quite contrary ſenſe from the whole diſcourſe and meaning of the Author, which was to exalte and magnify the authority of Princes, as deſcending from God, and not to debaſe the ſame, as he is calumniated. For proofe herof whoſoeuer will looke vpon the booke and place it ſelf before mentioned, ſhal find that *M. Reinolds* purpoſe therin is to proue, that albeit earthly principality, power and authority be called by the Apoſtle *humana creatura*: yet that it is originally from God, & by his commandement to be obeyed. His wordes are theſe: *Hinc enim eſt &c.* hence „ is it, that albeit the Apoſtle doe call all earthly princi- „ pality *a humaine creature*, for that it is placed in certaine „ men (from the beginning) by ſuffrages of the people;

Reinaldus de iuſta Reip. auctoritate &c. c. 1. cited in Diſc. pa. 8.

1. Pet. 2.

M. Reinoldes diſcourſe.

yet

yet election of Princes doth flow from the law of nature, which God created; and from the vse of reason which God powred into man, and which is a little beame of diuine light drawne from that infinite brightnes of almighty God; therefore doth the Apostle *S. Paul* pronounce that *There is no power but from God, and that he which resisteth this power, resisteth God himselfe.* So *M. Reinoldes.*

27. And now let the indifferent Reader iudge whether *M. Reinoldes* hath byn calumniated in this allegation or no, & whether this Minister is led by any rule of conscience, and whether these be such *pregnant arguments* and proofes against vs as he promised at the first entrance of his booke. And for the matter in hand, he promised to proue, as yow haue heard, that we ascribed popular and Democraticall power to the people ouer Kings, which how well he hath performed by these places alleadged yow haue seene.

M. Reinolds abused by T. M.

28. Finally to stand no longer vpon this, whether we or they, Catholicks or Protestantes doe attribute more to popular licence, against Princes (when they giue not contentment) may aboundantly be seene in that we haue set downe before, and will ensue afterward, both of their doctrine and practises in like occasions. And so much of this first charge: now will we passe to the second.

29. The second is, that we ascribe *Monarchicall ciuill power and soueraignty ouer Kings vnto the Pope*: wherin first what he saith of *ciuill soueraignty* is a meere fiction and calumniation of his owne, if it be out of the Popes owne temporall Dominions. For we ascribe no such vnto him ouer other Princes or their subiects, but that authority or soueraignty only which Catholicke doctrine ascribeth to the Bishop of Rome as Successor to *S. Peter* Prince of the Apostles, & spirituall head of the vniuersall visible Church of Christ, which is

The secõd charge answered about the Popes authority.

only ſpirituall, & for ſpirituall ends, to wit, for the direction and ſaluation of ſoules. And if at any time he be forced to paſſe further then this, and by a certeine conſequence to deale in ſome temporall affaires alſo; it muſt be only indirectly in defence or conſeruation of the ſaid ſpirituall, that is to ſay, when the ſaid ſpirituall power apperteining to ſoules cannot otherwiſe be defended or conſerued, as more largely hath byn treated before.

30. This then is the ſumme and ſubſtance of Catholicke doctrine, about this point of the Popes authority, which from the beginning of Chriſtianity hath byn acknowledged in Gods Church, and in no place more then in *England*, where it hath byn both held & practiſed from the very firſt Chriſtened King of our nation *Ethelbert* vnto *K. Henry* the 8. for the ſpace of almoſt a thouſand yeares, without interruption, as largely and aboundantly hath byn ſhewed and laied forth to the view of all men in a late booke written in anſwere to *S. Edward Cookes* fifth part of *Reportes*; and this with great honor & proſperity of the Princes therof, and vnion of their people vnder their gouernment, and without ſuch odious or turbulent inferences, as now are made therevpon by vnquiet ſpirittes, that would ſet at warre euen mens imaginations in the ayer, therby to mainteine diſunion, diſcorde, and diffidence betweene Princes, and namely betweene our preſent noble Soueraigne and his Catholicke ſubiects.

The anſvver to S. Edvvard Cooke.

31. And firſt of all let vs heare this turbulent T. M. how vpon the enuy of this authority he frameth and foundeth all his enſuing reaſons. *VVe demaunde* (ſaith he) *how farre theſe pretended powers* (of people & Pope) *may extende, and heervpon we argue.* To which I anſwere, that in imagination they may extend ſo farre as any fantaſticall braine ſhall liſt to draw them; but in the

T. M. putteth his fictions for our poſitions,

true

true meaning of Catholicke reall doctrine, they can extend no further then hath byn declared. And as for the *popular power of people ouer Princes*, we haue now refuted the calumniation, & ſhewed that it is a mere fiction of his owne, and no poſition of ours; and that his Proteſtant doctrine doth aſcribe much more licence to popular tumult, then the Catholicke without compariſon: and for that of the Pope, I haue declared how it is to be vnderſtood to be of his owne nature in ſpirituall affaires only, without preiudice of ciuill Princely gouernement at all, and ſo the practice of the worlde and experience of ſo many Princes, great States and Monarches liuing quietly & ſecurely vnder the ſame authority, both in former times and ours moſt euidently doth proue and confirme.

32. But yet let vs ſee and conſider how falſely and calumniouſly this Make-bate doth herevpon argue in his third reaſon, inferring for his aſſumption or *minor* propoſition thus: *But all Popish Prieſtes vpon this pretended Supremacy and prerogatiue of Pope and people, doe vtterly abolish the title of ſucceſsion in all Proteſtant Princes: Ergo.* Wherin to ſhew him a notable liar, it ſhall be ſufficient to name all the Proteſtant Princes, that haue had title of ſucceſsiō in our coūtrey (for therof he ſpeaketh principally) ſince the name of Proteſtant hath byn heard of in the world, being three in number, to wit *K. Edward* the ſixt, *Q. Elizabeth*, and K. *Iames* that now raigneth, all which were admitted peaceably to their Crownes, as well by Prieſtes as Catholicke people, who notwithſtanding in ſome of their admiſsions wanted not meanes to haue wrought diſturbances as the world knoweth: ſo as if one inſtance only doth truly ouerthrow any general propoſition; how much more doth this triple inſtance not able to be denied, ouerthrow and caſt to the ground this vniuerſal falſe aſſertion of T. M. which auerreth; *That all Popish Prieſts doe vt-*

Calumniation euidently cōuinced.

doe vtterly abolish the Succeßion of all Proteſtant Princes. Will he not be aſhamed to ſee himſelf cõuinced of ſo great and ſhameles ouerlaſhing?

33. And on the other ſide, one only Catholicke Princeſſe being to ſucceed in this time, to wit *Q. Mary*, we know what reſiſtance the Proteſtants made both by bookes, ſermons, Treatiſes and open armes; and how many Rebellions, conſpiracies, robberies, priuy ſlaughters, and other impediments were deſigned and practiſed afterward, during the few yeares ſhe raigned: we know alſo what was executed againſt the gouernment and liues of the two noble Catholicke Queenes her neereſt neighbours, & one of them moſt ſtraitly conioyned in bloud that raigned at that time in *Scotland*, to omit others before mẽtioned, that were debarred from their lawfull ſucceſsion, or excluded from their rightfull poſſeſsion for their Religion in *Sweueland*, *Flanders*, & other places as cannot be denied.

Catholick Princes ſucceſſiõs reſiſted by Proteſtãts.

34. Wherfore it is more then extraordinary impudency in T.M. to charge vs with that which is either peculier or more eminent in themſelues, and falſe in vs: and what or how farre this fellow may be truſted in theſe his aſſertions, may be gathered by the laſt ſentence of all his diſcourſe in this matter, where he hath theſe wordes: *F. Perſons* (in his *Doleman*) *doth pronounce ſentence, that whoſoeuer ſhall conſent to the ſucceßion of a Proteſtant Prince is a moſt grieuous and damnable ſinner.* And is it ſo in deed *Syr Thomas*? and will yow ſtand to it, and leeſe your credit if this be falſely or calumniouſly alleadged? then if yow pleaſe let vs heare the Authors owne wordes.

Calumniã tiõ againſt Doleman.

Doleman part 1. pag. 216.

35. And now (ſaith he) to apply all this to our purpoſe for *England*, and for the matter we haue in hand, I affirme and hold, that for any man to giue his helpe, conſent, or aſsiſtance towardes the making of a King, whome he iudgeth or belieueth to be faulty in Religion,

» » »

gion, and consequently would aduance no Religion, or the wrong, if he were in authority, is a most grieuous & damnable sinne to him that doth it, of what side soeuer the truth be, or how good or bad soeuer the party be, that is preferred. So he. And his reason is, for that he should sinne against his owne conscience in furthering such a King. And is there heere any word peculiar of a Protestant Prince, or of his succession? nay doth not the text speake plainly of *making a King* where none is? doth it not speake also indifferently of all sortes of Religion, *of what side soeuer the truth be*? How then can this malicious cauilling Minister expect to be trusted hereafter, or how may any man thinke that he speaketh or writeth out of conscience, seing him to vse such grosse shiftes and falshoodes in so manifest and important a matter? It is no marueyle that he set not his name at large to his booke, as not desirous to haue the dew praise of such desert.

T. M. his bad dealing.

To the rest of his reasons. §. 3.

BVt let vs passe a little further in these his deuises, for much I may not, both in regarde of the breuity which I haue designed vnto my self, & for the loathsomnes I take of such vncharitable railings, as in steed of reasons he casteth forth, with no greater authority, then of his owne assertion, or rather calumniation.

37. As for example in his fourth reason he subsumeth in his minor proposition thus: *But all Popish Priests doe dissolue the oath of obedience to all Protestant Gouernours.* And in the fifth: *But all Popish Priestes defend violent deposing of Kinges and Emperours.* And in the sixt: *But all Popish*

A rabblement of falſe illations.

Prieſtes are guylty of intending, deſigning, or practiſing murther of Princes. And in the ſeauenth: *But all Popish Prieſtes doe iuſtify the actes of treaſon and heynous parricides.* And yet further in the eight: *But all Popish Prieſtes profeſſe Rebellion, as ſoone as they can preſume of their ſtrength.* In the ninth likewiſe: *But all Popish Prieſtes are guylty of perfidy, for denying or violating with men of diuerſe Religion.* And laſtly in his tenth: *But all Romish Prieſtes* ex officio, *that is to ſay, as they are Prieſtes, muſt and doe profeſſe ſuch ſeditious poſitions, as thereby they are deſperate traitors. Ergo.*

38. And is it poſsible for any tongue (though borrowed from hell it ſelf, and embrewed with neuer ſo virulent or ſerpentine priſon) to vtter more precipitate malice then this? His propoſitions yow ſee are generall in all theſe aſſertions, to wit, that al Catholicke Prieſtes are guilty in all theſe accuſations, and the nature as yow know of a generall propoſition is ſuch, as if any one inſtance may be giuen to the contrary, it ouerthroweth the whole. And is it probable (thinke yow) that no one Prieſt may be found in England or elſwhere, deuoide of all theſe heynons accuſations, or of any one of them? Surely I am of opinion, that there will hardly be found any man ſo paſsionate on his owne ſide, which in this caſe will not condemne him of paſsion, precipitation, and conſcienceles calumniation. And we on the other ſide may well vrge to the contrary that no one Prieſt hath truely hitherto byn conuinced to haue treated or conſpired, or giuen conſent to the Princes death in all the long raigne of the Queene paſt, no not *Ballard* himſelf who only can be named to haue byn condemned for this pretence, though in deed his crime was, as of all the 14. Gentlemen that died with him, rather to haue deliuered Queene *Mary* out of priſon, then to depriue *Q. Elizabeth* of her life: and ſo they proteſted at their deathes.

Iniurious dealing of T.M.

39. But leauing this let vs come to examine ſome of the

of the pointes themselues, that are obiected: they are all (if yow consider them well) but little budes and branches deduced from one, and the selfe same roote of the Popes authority, and consequently but minced-meates made out in different seruices, by the cunning cookery of T. M. to feede the phantasies of such as hunger after variety of calumniations against the Catholicke doctrine. For what great difference is there (for example sake) betweene that which is treated in the fourth reason of *freeing subiectes from their obedience to Princes*, & the other of the fifth about *Deposing Princes*, or that of the sixt and seauenth of *designing their deathes, and of iustifying treasons against the same*? And so in the ninth *of oathes euacuated*, which was handled before vnder other tearmes in the fourth reason, wherby appeareth, that this mans purpose was (as before I haue noted) to straine matters to the vttermost, and to set out as many shewes of inconueniences, dangers and damages to ensue by our doctrine of Papall authority, as either his wit could deuise, or his malice vtter.

The Popes authority strained to many brãches of enuy.

40. And yet the seely fellow did not consider one instance vnanswerable, that might be giuen to all these his inuentions, which is the experience of so many ages, both in *England*, & other Kingdoms round about vs, wherin the Kings and Princes haue raigned prosperously (and doe at this day) notwithstanding this doctrine, and vse of the Popes power; & this not only Catholicke Princes, but diuers Protestant Potentates in like manner, for any thing that Popes haue done, or attempted against them. For what hath any Pope done against the Protestant Kings of *Denmarke* in this our age? what against those of *Sweueland* either Father or Sonne, though the later doth offer open iniury to a Catholicke King the true inheritor? what against the Dukes of *Saxony*, the Count *Palatines* and

Many Protestant Princes neuer molested by the Pope.

Proteſtant Princes of the Empire, notwithſtanding the ſaid Electors whole authority in that action was giuen them by the *Sea Apoſtolicke*, and conſequently doth depend therof? what againſt diuers other particular Princes both of the Empire and otherwiſe, who haue in this our age departed from the obedience of that *Sea*? how many hath it moleſted, cenſured, depoſed, or troubled for the ſame?

41. And that which is moſt of all to our purpoſe at this time, what manner of proceeding hath the ſame Sea Apoſtolicke vſed towardes the Kingdome of *Scotland*, and his Maieſty (that now ruleth alſo the ſcepter of *England*) for the ſpace of 36. yeares, wherin he raigned from an infant, after the iniuſt depoſition of his mother by her Proteſtant ſubiects? did the Sea of *Rome* or any Biſhop therof euer goe about to hurt or preiudice him? Or is it not well knowne that diuers Popes did endeauour to doe good and friendly actions for the preſeruation of his ſafty, when it was many times put in ieopardy by the Proteſtant party? And among other I can well remember that about the yeare 1585. when his Maieſty was beſieged by them in his towne and caſtle of *Striueling*, and driuen to yeeld vnto them both his owne royall perſon, and amongſt other articles this, as the Proteſtant Hiſtory it ſelf doth recount it, was one; *That his Maieſties olde guarde was to be remoued and another placed by them*: the Pope then liuing, hearing therof by his Maieſties Embaſſador in *France* the Archbiſhop of *Glaſco*, and others, he was ſo moued with compaſsion, as he offered an honorable contribution towards the preſeruation of his Maieſties perſon in that caſe, and eſpecially for maintenance of a truſty guard about the ſame: the like good will in other leſſe occaſions haue other Popes ſhewed in like manner. So as all is not fire and ſworde, excommunication, and anathematization, prodition, depoſi-

Kinde offices of the ſea Apoſtolick towardes his Maieſty of great Britanny.

See Thynnes addition to Holinshed pag. 446. & the booke of dangerous poſitions p. 26

Pope Gregor. 13.

depoſition, conſpiracy, murther, abſoluing of ſubiects, relaxation of oathes, and other ſuch hoſtile actions, as our ſeditious aduerſary heere laieth togeather to make the Popes office and authority more odious.

42. Only two publicke examples to my remembrance can be alleadged of any Proteſtant Princes excommunicated, cenſured, or moleſted by the Sea Apoſtolicke ſince *Luther* began his breach (which are now almoſt an hundred yeares) notwithſtāding there haue byn ſo many of them, and ſo exorbitant things committed by them againſt Catholicke Religion, and the ſaid Sea Apoſtolicke as is notorious to all men. And theſe two vpon ſpeciall cauſes and inducements, to wit, *Q. Elizabeth* of *England*, and King *Henry* then of *Nauarre*, and now alſo of *France* (for of King *Henry* of *England* I make no mention, for that his cauſe was not Religion at that time:) the firſt of the two, in regarde of the publicke violent change of Religion, which ſhee made in her Realme, with the depoſition, depriuation, impriſonment or exile of all Catholicke Biſhops, Prelates, Clergy, and others that would not yeeld their conſent thereunto, and this (as is alleadged) contrary to her publicke promiſe and oath at her Coronation.

Two Proteſtant Princes only cenſured by the Sea Apoſtolicke in our age.

Q. Elizabeth.

43. The ſecond for feare leaſt he comming to the Crowne of *France* in that diſpoſition wherin then he was preſumed to be, ſhould attempt the like change in that great Kingdome: And to both theſe actes were the Popes of thoſe times drawen and incited either ſecretly or openly by ſome of the chief Nobility of both Realmes, whome moſt it concerned. And albeit the former hath not had that ſucceſſe which was hoped, and perhaps ſuggeſted; yet the finall euent of the ſecond hath byn more proſperous, then at that time could be expected, no King lightly in Chriſtendome hauing made more reall demonſtratiõs of loue, vnion,

K. of Nauarre.

The happy ſucceſſe in the K. of France.

and reuerence to the Sea of *Rome* then his moſt Chriſtian Maieſty, nor receaued greater enterchange of graces, and fauours from the ſame Sea, and this in matters of moſt importance for the ſetling and eſtabliſhment of his Imperiall Crowne and royall race.

44. Wherfore al this bitter barking of this Miniſter T. M. about excommunicating, depriuing, depoſing, and murthering Princes, as alſo about abſoluing of ſubiectes from their oathes and the like, ceaſeth (as yow ſee) by a little good correſpondence betweene the ſaid Princes and their generall Paſtor. And when matters paſſe at the worſt, and are in moſt exaſperation betweene them: yet is it not the tenth part of perill which Proteſtant doctrine and practice draweth them into, vpon any generall diſguſt againſt their gouernments. For if in lue of theſe two Proteſtant Princes cenſured by the Sea Apoſtolicke, we ſhould recount all the Catholicke Princes that haue byn vexed, moleſted, iniured, or depriued of their States, or violated in their perſons, or brought to confuſion in our Northerne parts of the world in this time, to wit, in *Sauoy*, *France*, *Switzerland*, *Germany*, *Bemeland*, *Auſtria*, *Poland*, *Sweueland*, *Denmark*, *Flanders*, *England* and *Scotland*, and ſome other places wherof we haue treated more largely in the precedent Chapter; there would be no compariſon at all.

Proteſtant people more perilous thē Popes.

Of falſe dealing and ſleights of T. M. §. 4.

AND yet further yow muſt vnderſtand that this malicious calumniator propoſing vnto himſelf for his end to make vs hatefull, doth not only encreaſe, multiply, and exaggerate matters againſt vs by all art of ſyco-

of sycophancy, as making some things to seeme odious, that of themselues are true and laudable; and exaggerating others to a farre higher degree, then wherin they were spoken, or are to be vnderstood, inferring also generall propositions vpon some shewes of particuler proofes: but besides all this, he passeth also further, & obiecteth often times against vs the very same things that his owne Authours doe hold (wherof before we haue laid downe some examples, and shall doe more hereafter) yea shameth not manifestly to falsify and ly also; as when he auoucheth with great resolution, that the late K. *Henry* of *France* was censured by Pope *Xixtus.* V. *for this only crime, for that himselfe being a Papist, yet fauoured the Protestantes, and especially the Prince of Nauarre*: Wheras it is knowne that besides this, he had murthered most miserably two principall peeres & Princes of his Crowne, the Duke, and Cardinall of *Guise*, neerest in bloud to his Maiesty of *England*, and therby broken his solemne oath made but a little before in presence of many, when he receaued the Bl. Sacrament to the contrary. And how then was *his only crime to haue fauoured the Protestants*, as this Minister auerreth?

Examples of bad dealing in T. M.

Disc. p. 31.

46. And againe in the same place or precedent page he hath these wordes: *Pope Adrian being guilty of like seditious practice against the Emperour Henry the second, was choked with a fly.* And in his quotation citeth *Nauclerus* for it, *Generatione* 139. which should be 39. for that *Nauclerus* hath nothing neere so many Generations in that Part, and in steed of *Henry* the second, he should haue said *Frederick* the first of that name, for that *Henry* the second was before the time of our Conquest, and almost two hundred yeares before *Adrian* the fourth our English Pope, of whome we now speake who liued in the time of *King Stephen* and *King Henry* the second of *England*, and was a Holy man, and accompted the Apo-

Naucl. p. 1. gener. 39.

Our English Pope Adrian egregiously abused by T. M.

stle

stle of *Noruegia* for conuerting the same to our Christian faith, before he was Pope, and all Authors doe write honorably of him, & so doth *Nauclerus* affirme: and therefore though he make mention of such a fable related by *Vrspergensis* that was a Schismatical writer in those dayes (who also doth not absolutely auouch it, but with this temperament *vt fertur*, as the reporte goeth) yet doth the said *Nauclerus* reiect the same as false, and confuteth it by the testimonies of al other writers, especially of Italy, that liued with him, and therby knew best both his life and death. And yet all this notwithstanding will this false ladde T. M. needes set downe this History as true, affirming it for such, and neuer so much as giuing his Reader to vnderstand, that any other denied the same, or that the only Author himself of this fiction doubted therof. And is not this perfidious dealing? or can any man excuse him from falshood and malice in this open treachery?

47. Another like tricke he plaieth some few pages before this againe, citing out of Doctor *Bouchiers booke, De iusta abdicatione* these wordes: *Tyrannum occidere honestum est, quod cuiuis impunè facere permittitur, quod ex communi consensu dico:* And then he Englisheth the same thus: *Any man may lawfully murder a Tyrant, which I defend (saith he) by common consent.* But he that shall read the place in the Author himself, shall find, that he holdeth the very contrary, to wit, that a priuate man may not kill a Tyrant, that is not first iudged and declared to be a publicke enemy by the common-wealth; and he proueth the same at large, first out of Scriptures, & by the decree of the General Councell of *Constance*, his wordes be these: *Neque verò eo iure quod ad Regnum habet, nisi per publicum iudicium, spoliari potest &c.* Neither can a Tyrant be depriued of that right, which he hath to a Kingdome, but only by publicke iudgment; yea further

Disc. f. 23.

A notable corruptiō about Doctor Bouchier.

further also so long as that right of Kingdome remaineth, his person must be held for sacred, wherof ensueth, that no right remaineth to any priuate man against his life: & albeit any priuate man should bring forth neuer so many priuate iniuries done by the said Tyrãt against him; as that he had whipped him with yron rods, oppressed him, afflicted him, yet in this case must he haue patience, according to the admonition of S. Peter: *That we must be obedient not only vnto good and modest Lordes, but also vnto those that be disorderly, and that this is grace, when a man for Godes cause doth sustaine and beare with patience iniuries vniustly done vnto him &c.* 1. Pet. 2.

48. And in this sense (saith he) is the decree of the Councell of *Constance* to be vnderstood, when they say: *Errorem in fide esse &c. It is errour in faith to hold (as Iohn VVickcliffe did) that euery Tyrant may be slaine meritoriously by any Vassall or subiect of his, by free or secret treasons &c.* Thus writeth that author, holding as yow see, that no Tyrant whatsoeuer, though he be neuer so great a Tyrant, may be touched by any priuate man, for any priuate iniuries, though neuer so great, nor yet for publicke, though neuer so manifest, except he be first publickly cõdemned by the common-wealth; which is another manner of moderation, and security for Princes, then the Protestant doctrine before rehearsed: and namely that of *Knox*, vttered in the name of the whole Protestant Congregation both of *Scotland* and *Geneua: If Princes be Tyrantes against God and his truth, his subiectes are freed from their oathes of obedience.* So he. And who shall be Iudge of this? The people, *for that the people* (saith he) *are bound by oath to God to reuenge the iniury done against his Maiesty.* Let Princes thinke well of this, and let the Reader consider the malicious falshood of this Minister T. M. who in alleadging that little sentence before mentioned, about killing of a Tyrant, stroke out the wordes of most importance:

Consil. Constan. Sess. 15.

Catholick moderation towardes censuring of Princes.

Knox in hist. p. 372.

Knox apol. fol. 33.

quem hoſtem Reipublicæ iudicauerit; whome the commonwealth hath iudged for a publicke enemy; and adding that other clauſe, *which I ſay by common conſent*, which is not there to be found: And with ſuch people we are forced to deale, that haue no conſcience at all in coſenage, and yet they cry out of *Equiuocation* againſt vs, where it is lawfull to be vſed; making no ſcruple at all themſelues to ly, which in our doctrine is alwaies vnlawfull for any cauſe whatſoeuer.

49. But will yow heare a caſe or two more out of the Canon law, how dexterous Syr Thomas is in corrupting that which he loueth not, nor ſeemeth well to vnderſtand? yow may read in the fourth page of this his pamphlet an ancient decree (for ſo he calleth it) alledged by him out of *Gratian* in the gloſſe, determining that though a man haue ſworne to pay money to one that is excommunicated, yet is he not bound to pay the ſame, and he alledgeth the Latin text thus: *Si iurauí me ſoluturum alicui pecuniam qui excommunicatur, non teneor ei ſoluere*: If I haue ſworne to pay money to any man that is excommunicated, I am not bound to pay it, adding this reaſon: *Quia qualitercumq; poſſumus, debemus vexare malos vt ceſſent a malo*; We ought to vex euill men by what meanes ſoeuer we may, to the end they may ceaſe from doing euill. In the allegation of which little text, a man would hardly belieue how many falſe trickes there be, to make Catholicke doctrine to ſeeme odious and abſurd. For firſt theſe wordes not being found in any text of law or deciſion of any Pope or Councell, but only in the gloſſe or commentary, they make not any ancient or moderne decree, as the Miniſter falſly auoucheth, but rather ſhew the opinion of him, who writeth the commentary, if his wordes were as heere they are alledged.

Diſc pa. 4.

Another coſenage about a text of Gratian.

Apud Gra. cauſa 15. q. 6. cap. 4. gloſſ.

50. But the truth is, that the wordes of the gloſſe conteine

conteine only a certain obiection vpon a clause of a Canon, concerning promise to be obserued to one that is excommunicated after the promise was made; & the obiection or doubt is made in these wordes by the Authour of the glosse or Commentary: *Sed quid dices, si iurauí &c.* But what will you say, if I haue sworne „ to pay money to any person, or haue promised the „ same vnder some forfeiture, and in the meane space, „ he to whome I made the promise is excommunicated, „ am I bound to pay the same or not? This is the question, and then he argueth on both sides: and first for the negatiue, *videtur quod non*, it seemeth I am not, for that the Canon law saith *Causa.* 23. *q.* 6. *That we ought to afflict wicked men by all meanes possible, to the end they cease from their wickednes.* So he, alledging diuers other argumentes for the same opinion; but yet afterwardes comming to giue his owne resolution, he saith thus: *Verius credo, quòd licèt ille non habeat ius petendi, tamen debet ei solui.* I doe belieue the truer opiniõ to be, that albeit „ he that is so excommunicated doe leese his right to „ demaund his money, yet is the other bound to pay „ him. And for this he citeth diuers lawes and reasons therin mentioned, as namely, *Extrau. de Iu. debitoris, & extr. de sent. excommunicationis, Si verè, & 11. q. 3. Cum excommunicato.*

A doubt proposed & solued.

51. So as heere our Minister not of ignorance but of falshood taketh the *obiection* for the *resolution*, as *Plessy Mornay* did in his booke against the masse, where he would proue that *Scotus*, *Durand* and other schoole-deuines did doubt of the reall presence and transubstantiation, for that hauing proposed the question, they began to argue for the negatiue part, saying, *videtur quod non*, though afterwardes they resolued the contrary, & solued the argument. And the very like doth our Minister heere, calling this obiection of *videtur quod non*, not only a resolution but *an ancient Decree*. Se-

See of this Historie of the Disputation before the King of France annexed to the confut. of the first 6. moneths of Foxes Calendar.

condly there is wilfull deceipt in leauing out the firſt wordes of the Author, *Sed quid dices, ſi iuraui?* But what wil yow ſay, if I haue ſworne? which doe plainly ſhew that it is but an obiection. Thirdly that he alledgeth the reaſon of the obiection *Quia qualitercumque poſſumus &c.* for the reaſon of the reſolutiõ, which is falſe: for that the reſolution is made againſt that reaſon. Fourthly the true reſolution of the Commentor is vtterly concealed, and a contrary determination by him impugned ſet downe, and this not as a priuate opinion, but as an ancient *decree* of the law & Canon it ſelf. Conſider I pray yow how many fraudes and falſhoodes there be in one little quotation, and what a volume I ſhould be inforced to make, if I would examine exactly ſuch a multitude of citations as he quoteth againſt vs, but yet one or two more ſhall I produce in the ſame kinde and matter.

52. In the ſixt page of his *diſcouery* he hath this grieuous accuſation out of the Canon law againſt vs: *Haretici filij vel conſanguinei non dicuntur, ſed iuxta legem ſit manus tua ſuper eos, vt fundas ſanguinem ipſorum*, and then he quoteth thus: *Apud Grat. gloſſ. in Decret. li. 5. ex Decret. Gregor. 9. cauſ. 23. q. 8. cap. Legi.* Which diſtracted kind of quotation, ſeperating the firſt and laſt wordes, that ſhould haue gone togeather, ſeeme to import that he ſcarce read the bookes themſelues, but cited the ſame out of ſome other mans notes; but that fault were eaſily pardoned if he vſed no greater fraude in the thing it ſelf. For firſt he Engliſheth the wordes thus: *Heretickes may not be termed either children or kindred, but according to the old law thy hand muſt be againſt them to ſpil their bloud*: And then in the margent he ſetteth downe this ſpeciall printed note: *The profeſſed bloudy maſſacre againſt the Proteſtantes, without diſtinction of ſex or kinred.* And what can be more odiouſly vrged thẽ this? Now then let vs ſee how many falſe trickes and ſhiftes, fit for a

Another fraudulẽt caſe out of the Canon lavv.

Pro-

Proteſtant-Miniſter, doely lurking in this ſhort citation.

53. Firſt of all is to be conſidered, that this gloſſe or Commentary of the Canon law, which heere is both vntruly cited and maliciouſly applied, is vpon a Canon beginning *Si quis*, which Canon is taken out of the third Councell of *Carthage*, wherin the famous Doctour and Holy Father *S. Auguſtine* was preſent, as a cheife Biſhop, that had voice in that Councell, and the decree of the Canon is; that if any Biſhop ſhould inſtitute Heretickes or pagans for his heires, whether they were *conſanguinei or extranei*, kinſmen or externes, *ei Anathema dicatur, atque eius nomen inter Dei ſacerdotes nullo modo recitetur*: Let him be accurſed, & let not his name be remembred any way among the Prieſtes of God. *Decret. l. 5. de Hær. tit. 7. c. 5.*

54. This is the ſeuerity of that Canon, for ground wherof another precedent Canon ſetteth downe out of the ſame S. Auguſtine: *Quod Hæreticus perſeuerans æternaliter damnatur &c.* That an Heretick perſeuering in his Hereſy is damned eternally, neither can he recieue any profit by baptiſme, almes, martyrdome, nor any other good workes. So hath the title of the Canon, but the wordes of *S. Auguſtine* are theſe: *Firmiſſimè tene, & nullatenùs dubites &c.* Hold for moſt certaine and no wayes doubt, but that euery Hereticke or Schiſmaticke ſhall be partaker of hel fier euerlaſtingly, togeather with the diuell and his angelles, except before the end of his life he be reſtored and incorporated againe into the Catholicke Church; neither ſhall baptiſme or almes neuer ſo aboundantly beſtowed, no nor death it ſelf ſuffred for the name of Chriſt, profit him any thing to ſaluation. So *S. Auguſtine.* The ſeuere ſentence of S. Auguſtine againſt Hereticks. *Auguſt. l. de fide Cath.*

55. Vpon this ground then that Heretickes out of the Church, & ſo cenſured as heere yow haue heard, though they be neuer ſo neere of kin, may not be made heires, eſpecially by Church-men; the gloſſe

yeelding a reaſon therof, hath theſe wordes: *Quia iſti Hæretici iam non dicuntur filij vel conſanguinei, vnde dicitur in lege: ſi frater tuus, & amicus tuus, & vxor tua deprauare voluerit veritatem, ſit manus tua ſuper illos:* For that theſe Heretickes are not now called childrē or kinsfolke, therfore, as ſuch, they cannot be made Inheritours by Eccleſiaſticall men; wherupon it is ſaid in the law (of *Deuteronomie*) *if thy brother and friend or wife will goe about to deprave the truth, let thy hand be vpon them.* And preſently he citeth to the ſame effect, the authority of *S. Hierome*, out of another Canon, in another place of the law, as preſently we ſhall ſee.

Deut. 13.

56. So as firſt heere we may behold that T.M. hath not put downe this his quoted gloſſe as it is found in the true gloſſe it ſelf, but left out both the beginning: *Quia iſti Hæretici &c.* which imported ſomewhat to the vnderſtanding of his meaning; as alſo he left out the reaſon alledged by the gloſſe out of Gods owne wordes in *Deuteronomy*, to wit, the wilfull corrupting of his truth. And thirdly he added theſe wordes: *Vt fundas ſanguinem ipſorum*, which heere (as yow ſee) the gloſſe hath not, but they are cited out of *S. Hierome* in another Canon and volume of the law, where the Holy Father, excuſing to his friend *Riparius* a Prieſt, his earneſt zeale and deſire to haue *Vigilantius* the Hereticke (againſt whome he had written) puniſhed by his Biſhop, alledgeth diuers examples of ſeuerity in like caſes out of the Scripture, as of *Phinees*, *Elias*, *Symon Cananeus*, *S. Peter*, *S. Paul*, and laſtly citeth alſo the foreſaid wordes of Gods ordinance in *Deuteronomy*: *If thy brother, thy wife, thy friend &c. ſhall goe about to peruert thee from Gods true worship &c. heare him not, nor conceale him, but bring him forth to iudgment, and let thy hand be vpon him firſt, and then after the hand of all the people &c.* which is to be vnderſtood according to the forme of law appointed afterward in the 17. Chapter: *That he be orderly*

Hier. contr. vigilant. cit. a Gratiano cauſ. 23. q. 8. c. legi.

brought

brought forth to iudgment, and then when ſentence is paſſed againſt him, he which heard or ſaw him commit the ſinne, and is a witnes againſt him, muſt caſt the firſt ſtone at him, and the reſt muſt follow. And this alſo doth the ordinary Commentary or gloſſe of *Lyranus* and others vpon thoſe textes of Scripture declare.

57. And now let the iudicious Reader conſider how many corruptions this craſty Miniſter hath vſed to bring forth to his purpoſe, this one little diſtracted text, for proof of profeſſed bloudy maſſacres intended by vs againſt Proteſtantes. For firſt he corrupteth the wordes of the gloſſe apparantly, and that in diuers pointes, leauing out that which the gloſſe ſaith, and adding that which the gloſſe hath not: then he corrupteth the meaning both of gloſſe and Canon, deprauing that to a wicked ſenſe of bloudy maſſacring without diſtinction of ſex or kinred; which the Canon and Councell of *Carthage* with *S. Auguſtine* meant only of ciuill puniſhment againſt Heretickes, to wit that they could not be made heires to Eccleſiaſticall men. Thirdly he peruerteth in like manner *S. Hieromes* intent, which was that albeit he wiſhed that Heretickes ſhould be puniſhed alſo bodily, yet by order and forme of law, and not that any one ſhould kill another, & much leſſe by bloudy maſſacres, as this fellow ſetteth it downe in his marginall note. And laſtly he preſumeth to peruert the very wordes of God himſelf in the law, by tranſlating *fundas ſanguinem ipſorum*, ſpill their bloud, inſteed *of shed their bloud*, as though God were a bloud-ſpiller, or comaunded the ſame to be done vniuſtly by others: but all is ſtrained by the Miniſter to make vs odious, wheras himſelf indeed is therby made ridiculous. And for that I haue byn ſomewhat longer in this example then I had purpoſed, as alſo for that by this one (if it were but one) yow may gheſſe of al the reſt of his proceeding, I wil heere ceaſe,

A Catalogue of corruptions.

ceaſe, referring the reſt of this kinde, to other more fit places and occaſions afterwardes.

58. And yet truly I cannot wel pretermit, for ending this Chapter, one little note more of rare ſingularity in this man aboue others, which I ſcarce euer haue obſerued in any one of his fellowes, and this is, that the very firſt wordes of Scripture alledged by him in the firſt page of his booke, for the poeſy of his pamphlet are falſly alleadged, corrupted and mangled, though they conteine but one only verſe of *Iſay* the Prophet; and then may yow imagine, what liberty he will take to himſelf afterward throughout his whole diſcourſe. His ſentence or poeſy is this: *Iſay.29.verſ.9. But ſtay your ſelues and wonder, they are blinde and make yow blinde*, which he would haue to be vnderſtood of vs Catholickes: but let any man read the place of *Iſay* it ſelf, and he ſhall finde no ſuch matter either in wordes or ſenſe, but only the word *wonder*, to wit *obſtupeſcite & admiramini, fluctuate & vacillate, inebriamini, & non a vino, mouemini, & non ab ebrietate:* And according to this are the Greek and Hebrew textes alſo. So as what ſhould moue T.M. to ſet downe ſo corruptly the very firſt ſentence of his booke, and cite the Chapter and verſe wherin his fraude may be deſcried I know not, except he obſerued not the laſt clauſe of the Prophetes precept, *mouemini, & non ab ebrietate*. And ſo much for this.

The very firſt text of Scripture alledged by him moſt corruptly.

HOW

HOVV THIS TREATISE VVAS LAIED ASIDE

By ſickneſſe of the Author,

and ſome other cauſes.

And why it was taken in hand againe vpon the ſight of a Catholicke Anſwere, and a new Reply of T. M. dedicated to his Maieſty: with the Authors iudgment of them both.

CHAP. III.

HAuing written hitherto and paſſed thus far-forth in examination of the Miniſters opprobrious libel of *Diſcouery*, I was partly forced by grieuous ſickneſſe that continued for ſome moneths, & partly alſo induced (for that I vnderſtood that another Catholicke man had anſwered the ſaid libell) to lay that which I had written a ſide, as alſo for that the occa-

ſion of time, wherin this Treatiſe was begun, ſoone after the detection of the often forenamed powder-treaſon, ſeemed in great part to be paſt, and hauing once laied it out of my handes, had no great will afterward to goe forward therwith, as an argument of loathſome contention, againſt moſt odious imputations and calumniations: but yet after diuers monethes againe, ſeing the ſaid Catholicke anſwere to appeare (which before I had not viewed) togeather with a large *Reply* to the ſame by the Miniſter that firſt made and deuiſed the libell; and that the ſaid Miniſter had now reſolued vpon inſtance of the ſaid Anſwerer to manifeſt his name, to wit of *Thomas Morton*, which before went ciphered with the letters only of T. M. that might aſwell haue ſignified *Thomas Malmesbury* or *Montague* or *Monte-banke*, or any ſuch like ſur-name: and further that he preſumed to dedicate the ſame vnto the Kinges Maieſty, by a ſpeciall gloſing Epiſtle, full of fond Miniſteriall malice againſt Catholickes, intituling his ſaid Reply: *A full ſatisfaction concerning a double Romish iniquity, heynous Rebellion, and more then heathenish Equiuocatiõ.* And further that he had encreaſed his ſaid worke with two or three new Treatiſes, partly for iuſtifying of Proteſtantes in the caſe of Rebellion, and partly for confuting of a Treatiſe written in defence of Equiuocation, I was moued aſwell of my ſelf, as by others exhortation, to reſume the thing into my handes againe, & to adioine by the view of the whole that which was wanting to the full confutation of this Miniſters iniquity, in laying ſuch heinous Rebellion & heatheniſh Equiuocation vnto Catholickes charge, who of all men liuing are moſt free from iuſt reprehenſion in them both: and the *Caluinian* ſect and ſectaries conuinced to be moſt guilty in the one, and conſcienceleſſe in the other, as the iudicious Reader (I doubt not) ſhall ſee euidently proued

T.M. his nevv Reply.

proued and confirmed in that which is to enſue.

2. It moued me alſo not a little to goe forward ſomewhat with this confutation (though in as breiffe manner as might be) to ſee that this deuiſe (though neuer ſo fond and falſe) of charging Catholicke doctrine with Rebellion & Equiuocation, was applauded not a little by ſome men of marke in our State; as namely by his Maieſties late Attorney Generall, aſwel in his writing, as pleadinges againſt Catholicks, borrowing from this Miniſters firſt Treatiſe diuers large parcelles, and paſſages of his calumnious imputations, about the forenamed two heades of Rebelliõ and Equiuocation, & lending him againe in lue therof for his ſecond *Reply* ſundry obſeruations & collections of his owne, concerning diuers Kings of *England*, that ſeemed to him not ſo much to fauour or acknowledge the Biſhop of *Rome* his authority ouer the Engliſh Church, which yet now vpon further ſearch, is found to be contrary, and ſo ſet downe and demonſtrated at large by a late Anſwere publiſhed to the ſaid Attorney his booke of *Reportes*, as I thinke in haſt will not be anſwered. Wherupon, forſomuch as this new deuiſed accuſation, of Rebellious doctrine and Equiuocation, is taken vp by ſo many handes of thoſe that be enemies to Catholicke Religion; I thought it conuenient to cleere ſomewhat more this matter; and as I had, before I laid aſide this worke, treated ſufficiently, as it ſeemed to me, of the former point, concerning Rebellious doctrine, vpon the ſight only of T. M. his firſt pamphlet (as in the precedent two Chapters yow haue ſeen) yet now vpon the appearance of this Miniſter *Thomas Morton* in his proper name and perſon, & of his new Reply that promiſeth full ſatisfaction in all; it ſeemed neceſſary that I ſhould goe forward to finiſh my firſt intent, and to examine the ſecond point or head of his accuſation in like manner, apperteining

T. M. lendeth and borrowveth of S. Edvvard Cooke.

to the doctrine of Equiuocation, made no leſſe odious now by continuall clamours of ſycophancy, then the other of Rebellion it ſelfe.

3. One other circumſtance alſo ſtirred me greatly to proceed in this ſhort worke, which was, that togeather with theſe bookes ſent out of *England*, aduertiſement was giuen, that this Miniſter *Thomas Morton* was Chaplain to my Lord of *Canterbury*, who being head of the ſpirituall Court of Arches, which is, or ought to be the ſupreame for matters of cõſcience in England, I was in hope to haue ſome remedy againſt this his Lordſhips Chaplaine, if I ſhould demonſtrate, that he dealeth againſt all conſcience, obſeruing no law, either of truth or modeſty towardes Catholick men in this his Reply, nor any regard either to his owne or Maiſters honour, he behauing himſelf ſo fraudulently againſt his owne knowledge and conſcience, as in this writing he doth. And if I proue not this afterward, by multiplicity of manifeſt & manifold examples, as in part yow haue ſeene that I haue done before, let me be thought to haue done him iniury (which willingly I would not doe vnto the worſt man liuing) in which place I hold not him, though by his pen I muſt needes iudge him to be bad inough.

T.M. my Lord of Canterburies Chaplaine

4. Now then to the point it ſelf of his Reply, which he calleth, as hath byn ſaid, *A full ſatisfaction*; it ſeemeth to me as full as pipes and hoggeſheades are wont to be heere in theſe countreys at the time of vintage, when they are full only of winde and aire and nothing els; and ſo yow ſhall ſee afterwardes, that this his Reply is full of wordes without ſubſtance, of floriſh without truth, of fraude without reall dealing: for that lightly he ſcarſely alledgeth any text of his Aduerſaries wryting, without ſome ſort of ſophiſtication both of wordes and ſenſe, or other like knackes. And further ſo diſtracteth and diſmembreth his aduerſaries threed of ſpeach,

The Miniſters manner of dealing.

of ſpeach, citing one branch of it in one part of his Reply, another in another, one ſentence firſt that ſhould haue byn laſt, and another laſt that ſhould haue byn firſt, therby to confound the Readers memory; one period halfe deuided, the other quartered, the third left out, the fourth diſguiſed: ſo as it is euident that he ſought rather to fly, to couer, ſhaddow, and hide himſelf, then really and ſubſtantially to come to the combate, as examples enſuing ſhall make all manifeſt.

5. But heere perhaps ſome will ſay, that this ſeemeth a meruaile vnto them, for that this man pretendeth to deale more diſtinctly and exactly then others, for that he ſetteth downe ſeuerally, plainly, and cleerly, firſt the wordes of his former pamphlet of Diſcouery, then the text of his aduerſary (the moderate anſwerer) and thirdly the full ſatisfaction of his faithfull Reply. And furthermore he draweth euery thing to diuiſions and ſubdiuiſions, diſtinctions & contrapoſitions, which make a iolly floriſh in the Readers eye, being ſet downe in logicall rancke. As for example, in his firſt reaſon, for ſetting Catholickes and Proteſtantes at debate, he ſaith he will proue it thus.

Fond florishes of T. M.

By a threefold euidence from a Popish.

1. Definition of an Heretick.
2. Explication of a perſon excommunicate.
3. Application of Romiſh Cenſures to them both.

And then the laſt member againe is proued:

By Popish.

1. Councelles.
2. Bulles.
3. Doctours.

6. And is not this plaine and cleere ſaith one? Yes, to entertaine Children by ſound of wordes, or pleaſing pictures. But when we come to the ſubſtance, & find that neither he alledgeth his Aduerſaries ſpeech ſincerely, nor anſweareth truly to the ſenſe, but either diſſembleth the ſame, or runneth a ſide, or confirmeth his ſaid aduerſaries argument, by his feeble anſwers, what importeth this oſtentation of bare and ydle fillables?

7. But you will ſay that he ſeemeth to haue ſeene and read much of our moderne Catholicke Authors, and to alledge them more abundantly in his text and margent then commonly other writers of his coat & calling haue hitherto done, for euery where almoſt he quoteth *Vaſquez*, *Suarez*, *Tolet*, *Bellarmine*, *Cunerus*, *Azor*, *Alfonſus de Caſtro*, *Sayer*, *Gregorius de Valentia*, *Bannes*, and others, which I graunt, that he hath ſeene and taken a view of them and others, if they be notes of his owne gathering, but he hath conſidered of them, as Satan had conſidered of *Iob*, and his actions, when God ſaid vnto him: *Numquid conſideraſti ſeruum meum Iob?* and he ſignified, yea, but it was to bely and calumniate him; and ſo hath this fellow conſidered of our Catholicke authors, not only to ſlaunder them what he may, but manifeſtly to falſify and corrupt them in many places both in wordes, meaning and whole drift of their diſcourſes, as in part yow haue ſeene already, and ſhall more largely and particulerly vpon iuſt occaſions afterwardes.

Hovv T. M. conſidered our Catholick Authors.

Iob 1.

8. Nor hath this whole Reply of his, though bigge in bulke, any ſubſtantial point almoſt handled therin, either about the one or the other two partes of his ſubiect propoſed, to wit, Rebellion, and equiuocation; wherby he would diſſolue all friendly combination, and aſſociation betweene Catholick and Proteſtant people; for as concerning the firſt, he hath no

more

more in effect, but that which before hath byn touched in his ten deuiſed and diſtended Reaſons: That we hold Proteſtantes for Heretiques excommunicate, and ſubiect to all the penalties of Eccleſiaſticall Canons made by the Church againſt ancient Hereticques: That we aſcribe power to the Biſhop of Rome in certaine caſes, to cenſure, to excommunicate, to depriue Princes, wherof is inferred, that ſuch and ſuch daungers may enſue, which finally is nothing els, but *may*, ſo as the queſtion being *De futuris contingentibus*, of thinges contingent to come (wherof the Philoſopher ſaith there is no ſcience) all remaineth in vncertainty, but only the ſuſpition & hatred which he would raiſe againſt vs: but what the Proteſtantes doctrine hath done & doth at this day againſt lawfull Princes in their Realmes, the armies in the low countreys, *Hungary*, *Poland*, *Suetia* and other places, doe teſtify not only to our ears, as things abſent, but as preſent alſo to our eyes, & then muſt I inferre, that where we haue ſo many examples of ſo manifeſt experience and preſent action, where we ſee and behold and feele with our ſenſes what paſſeth, and what hath paſſed, and what is like to enſue daily by the notorious vnquiet ſpirits of new Ghoſpellers, vnder any Prince whatſoeuer that contenteth not their humours. What ſhall we ſtand wrangling with this Miniſter, or any his like, about poſsibilities or coniecturall probabilities? What may fall out in time againſt his Maieſty, for example, of *Great Britany*, who hath byn a King, a Proteſtant King, almoſt forty yeares, and neuer receaued hurt or diſquietnes from any Pope, though diuers haue byn in that Sea within the compaſſe of this time, and many other Kinges and Princes both in *Denmark*, *Sueueland* and *Germany* for more yeares without moleſtation receaued or offred frõ the ſaid Sea, which I dare auouch no Catholicke Prince, King or Emperour can ſay that he hath

Ariſtoteles lib. Prior.

Fevv Proteſtant Princes troubled by Popes in our daies.

he hath paſſed halfe ſo many years in quiet gouernmẽt ouer Proteſtant people, vnto whome their doctrine giueth as great power ouer Princes in that caſe, as we aſcribe to Popes and farre greater; wherin I remit me, to that which hath byn ſaid and demonſtrated in the precedent two Chapters.

9. And now to end about this firſt point of our Miniſters Reply, that wheras in his former libell of ten reaſons, intituled, *A diſcouery of popish doctrine &c.* He ſet downe in his firſt reaſon, for proofe of our inſociability with proteſtantes, that we hold them for excommunicate Hereticks, & ſubiect to all the penalties belonging to ſuch men, wherof one among the reſt is, that we muſt fly them, and auoid their conuerſation; the anſwerer of the pamphlet, for better milding and pacifying the diſtempered humour of this enraged Miniſter, told him that Engliſh Proteſtantes were not ſimply held in that accompt with vs, to wit for excommunicate Heretickes, in ſuch degree as they were either to be auoided, or ſubiect to the penalties apointed by holy Canons for ancient Heretickes; vnderſtanding (as himſelf doth ſufficiently inſinuate) this to be in regard that they are not, nor any among them to his knowledge, expreſſely, and by name denounced and condemned for conuict in that behalf, which circumſtance of particuler condemnation and denuntiation, by moſt lawiers and Deuines opinions is neceſſary, before the ſaid puniſhmentes, eſpecially externall, can be inflicted, albeit the internall, to wit, the loſſe of grace, ſeparatiõ from the Church, excommunicatiõ, & the like be incurred *ipſo facto*, by the holding and profeſsing of any condemned Hereſy whatſoeuer, as before in the precedent Chapter more largely we haue declared.

Hovv Proteſtantes vvere denied by the Anſvverer to be ſubiect to the penalties of Hereſy.

10. But for the externall puniſhments, as debarring from conuerſation and communication with them,

loſſe

loſſe of goodes, honours, and dignities, depriuation of offices, inhability to inherit, note of infamy, incapacity of Chriſtian buriall, and the like, there being two opinions betweene Catholicke writers, the one more large and mild, that none of theſe puniſhments are to be actually incurred, but after particuler denuntiation and ſentence giuen by a Iudge againſt the party, the other more ſeuere, that in ſome caſes, the notoriouſnes of the thing may be ſo great, as in ſome part they may therby be incurred without ſentence; *the iuſt & moderate anſwerer* (for ſo he intituleth his booke, and in this point ſheweth it by effectes) made choice rather of the more temperate, & mild opinion; which in like manner is the more vniuerſall among both Canoniſtes and Catholicke Deuines, he thinking it ſufficiēt to cite only to that purpoſe, as in his anſwere he did, the Councell of *Lateran*, *Cunerus*, *Nauar* and others, but he might haue cited many more: for in truth it is the more common opinion by much, as may be ſeene by the wordes of theſe learned men enſuing: *Antoninus p. 3. tit. 25. cap. 3. Angelus verbo* Excomunicat. *8. n. 3. Sotus. 4. diſt. 22. q. 1. art. 1. Victor in ſumma de Sacram. tract. de excom. Armilla verbo* Excomunicat. *nu. 50. Roſel. excommunicat. 6. nu. 44. Siluest. verb.* Excommunicat. *5. q. 3. Caëtan. in ſumma. Ledes. 4. diſt. q. 23. art. 1.* and diuers others.

Of two opinions the more moderate followed by the Anſwerer.

Moderate Anſwere cap. 1. §. *Sixtly.*

11. But now this Miniſter finding that ſome Catholicke Author did hold the other opinion in like manner, that in certaine caſes ſome of the forenamed puniſhmentes might be incurred before particular denunciation by an Eccleſiaſticall Iudge, triumpheth greatly, as though he had taken the ſaid anſwerer at great aduantage, and found plauſible matter to entertaine cauillation againſt him, and therupon ſpendeth diuers Chapters of his Reply in citing ſome of thoſe Authors to his purpoſe, without telling his Reader,

Reply c. 4. §. 6. &c.

that it is a matter in diſpute or queſtion among Catholicke writers; but as though all were cleere and reſolued on his ſide, he citeth not only *Panormitan*, *Bannes*, and others, but the Ieſuite alſo *Gregorie de Valentia*, in theſe wordes: *If the guilt of Hereſy be ſo notorious* (*ſaith he*) *as that by no euaſion it can be concealed, the party doth incurre the penalty, thus far, that his ſubiectes may deny ſuch a Lord all fealty, yea before the ſentence of iudgment.* In alledging of which authority, though but ſhort, as you ſee, he vſeth the ſame fraud which commonly yow ſhall find in all the reſt, or moſt part of his allegations, to wit, that ſomewhat is mangled, added, or left out of purpoſe to make the thing ſound againſt vs, as heere the Latin text hath, *Hæreſis ſiuè Apoſtaſiæ à fide*, of Hereſy or Apoſtaſy from the faith, and then *pœna prædicta incurritur ex parte*, the foreſaid puniſhment is in part incurred: and laſtly, *Non tamen ita, vt teneantur* (*ſubditi*) *Domino Hæretico aut Apoſtatæ obſequium negare*; but yet that ſubiectes are not bound to deny obedience to their Lord that is an Hereticke or Apoſtata; all with moderations our Miniſter cutteth of, and leaueth out, to the effect that yow may imagine. But for that of theſe trickes we ſhall haue afterward occaſiõ to treat more particulerly, I will intermit the ſame now, & returne to ſpeake a word or two more, of the foreſaid moderate Anſwere made to the Miniſters ſlaunderous diſcouery, ſoone after the publication therof in England; though not come to my handes in many monethes after.

Greg. de val. to. 3. diſp. 1. q. 12. de Apoſtas. pu. 2. para. 4.

12. And wheras the Anſwerer both in regard of the exaſperation of times then running, and to performe the title of his booke, which is, A iuſt and moderate Anſwer, indeauoreth euery where prudently to fly the occaſion of more offence and exulceration, and to worke the moderation that he might, without iniury of the truth (for this ſeemeth to haue byn his purpoſe)

eſpecially

eſpecially in affirming, *that no Proteſtantes are held by vs for excommunicate Heretickes* (meaning therby, denounced by name, as before hath byn declared:) this other ſtickler and ſtirrer of coles will needes take vpon him to proue at large, that Proteſtantes are eſteemed to be truly Hereticks, excommunicate, and ſubiect to all the Cenſures of the Church, which any ancient Hereticke was in times paſt: and to this effect he bringeth in the definition of an Hereticke, ſet downe by Catholicke writers, the explicatiõ of perſons excommunicate, and the application of Eccleſiaſticall Cenſures againſt them both, which he proueth by three meanes, to wit, of Generall Councelles, Popes Decrees, and Doctors iudgmentes; by all which he proueth Proteſtantes to be eſteemed Heretickes, & held for guilty of all the paines and penalties therof, both internall and externall, ſpirituall and temporall, in the ſight, ſenſe and opinion of all the vniuerſall Catholicke Church, for many ages togeather; And is not he worthy of a good fee thinke yow for pleading for Proteſtantes in this manner?

T. M. vvill needes proue Proteſtantes to be held for Heretickes.

13. But whatſoeuer he may deſerue in this (which I leaue to other mens iudgmentes) I muſt needes ſay, that in two or three other pointes, he hath deſerued little of the Proteſtant cauſe, and ſo I thinke will his Lord and Maiſter ſay, when he ſhall make true reflexion vpõ the caſe; for firſt he hath brought in a needleſſe cõpariſon betweene the ſtirring humours of Proteſtant & Catholicke people, in matter of obedience to their Princes, which muſt needs fal out to the great diſgrace of the Proteſtant party, as by the afore alledged examples and other proofes may appeare and be ſeene by the eye.

T. M a bad Proctor for Proteſtantes.

14. Secondly he taketh vpon him yet more fondly in the ſecond part of this his Reply, to make a publique iuſtification of all Proteſtantes for rebelling a-

gainſt their Princes, in any countrey whatſoeuer, but more particulerly and eſpecially in England, & therin doth ſo iuſtify *Cranmer, Ridley, Syr Tho. VVyat*, & others that conſpired againſt *Q. Mary* in England, *Knox, Buchanan, Goodman*, and like Miniſters in Scotland, turning vpſide downe that State againſt their Soueraignes, the Rebellions raiſed in *Suetia, Polonia, Germany, Switzerland, France*, and other countreys, as his iuſtification is a more plaine condemnation of them, and their ſpirits and doctrine in that behalfe, then if he had ſaid nothing at all, as partly ſhall afterwardes appeare, by ſome inſtances that we ſhall alledge therof.

15. Thirdly he doth with as little diſcretion bring in that accuſation before mentioned of hard wordes vſed by ſome of our Authors againſt his party that followeth *Caluins* doctrine: as namely; That they belieue no one article truly of the Chriſtian Creed, That they are Heretickes, & therin far worſe and in more damnable ſtate thē Turkes, Iewes or Infidelles; That their doctrine leadeth by conſequence to Turciſme and Infidelity &c. for by this occaſion both the Author of the moderate Anſwere hath alledged many cleere authorities of principall Proteſtantes themſelues, that are of the ſame opinion, and we haue added many more therunto, in the precedēt Chapter of this booke, wherby is made manifeſt, that the profeſsion of *Caluins* doctrine is no leſſe held for Hereſy, Apoſtaſy, and infidelity by all other ſortes of Proteſtantes of our daies, then by Catholicke men themſelues; and much more may be added for iuſtification of that point which needed not to haue byn brought in, but vpon this occaſion, to ſhew that Engliſh Proteſtantes are held for Hereticks, not only by the Catholick Church whoſe iudgment moſt importeth, but by the cheiffe pillars alſo of the Proteſtantes profeſsion in other countreys. And when I doe name Hereſy and Heretickes,

The imputation of Hereſy vnto Proteſtantes indiſcretely brought in by T. M

tickes, the prudent Reader will remember that I doe name the moſt heinous and damnable thing that any Chriſtian cogitation can comprehend, no matter of ieſt or diſpute, but of terrour and teares.

16. Fourthly I can as little commend the Miniſters wit for drawing into the field againe a new diſputation, and ſpeciall Treatiſe of his, adioined in the end of this his Reply, about Equiuocation or doubtfull ſpeeches, ſometimes lawfull to be vſed for good and pious endes, and for auoiding ſinne and other hurtes both ſpirituall & temporall, wherin though the lawfulnes and neceſsity therof both by law of nature, diuine and humane, haue byn made euident, vpon diuers occaſions in England theſe later yeares, ſince this calumniation was raiſed againſt vertuous and learned mē about the ſame; yet one proofe wee ſhall adde more heere in this place, which before I haue not ſeen ſet downe at any length, which is that not only Proteſtantes themſelues doe both vſe and abuſe the ſame, as the Anſwerer declareth; but that this very Author our Miniſter that inueigheth ſo ſharpely & ignorantly againſt the manner of ſpeech, which he calleth Equiuocation, is forced in almoſt infinite places of his Reply, either to graunt that he doth Equiuocate, or els that he lyeth flatly. And for this alſo I remit my ſelf to the proofes that after ſhall enſue.

T.M. an example of Equiuocation.

17. And ſo to conclude this Chapter, concerning my iudgment about the Anſwere and Reply to the foreſaid Diſcouery of Rebellion and Equiuocation, I muſt needes ſay, that the Anſwerer hath endeauored to effectuate ſo much as he promiſed in the title of his booke, which was, of *a iuſt and moderate Anſwere*, and in performance therof, hath not only borne on matters temperately, as before hath byn ſhewed, but ſpared alſo his Aduerſary in many pointes, and namely in paſsing ouer his allegations without note or check,

hauing not perhaps either time or commodity of bookes to examine the ſame, or perſwading himſelf, that in ſo ſmall a pamphlet, and palpable matter, a Miniſter would not aduenture to vſe ſo many falſifications; but he was deceaued, not knowing ſo well this generation of men, who finding their cauſe deuoid of truth, are forced to hold vp the credit therof by ſleightes of falſhood. In the reſt, the Anſwerer quitteth himſelf learnedly, and ſheweth much reading in particuler, as by the multiplicity of Authors by him alledged doth well appeare. But the Replier is ſo far of from performing his promiſe, *of a full ſatisfaction concerning double Romish Iniquity*, as he hath ſcarce ſatisfied fully or meanly any one argument or authority alledged by his aduerſary, who though I may preſume he will beſt declare himſelf by his Reioinder to this Reply, if he thinke him worthy of ſo much labour (as in truth I doe not, eſpecially at this time, when ſo grieuous puniſhmentes are procured in England by him & his like for ſuch as doe preſume to anſwer their bookes:) yet meane I alſo briefly in this Treatiſe, by ſome examples to make it manifeſt, leauing the reſt to himſelf to be treated, and refuted by him more largely & abundantly, when he ſhall thinke it beſt conuenient; my purpoſe being only to lay forth in general the iniuries which this Miniſter doth offer vnto all Catholick people, by ſlaundering them in the foreſaid two odious accuſations of Rebelliō & Equiuocation, wherof hauing treated ſufficiently about the firſt in the two foregoing Chapters (and ſhall doe more in two other that enſue) we meane by Godes help to paſſe thence to the other generall head of Equiuocation, & to handle the ſame with no leſſe euidency of truth, equity and piety of Catholicke doctrine therin, then hath byn declared in the other before cōcerning our innocency, wherin I remit me willingly to the indifferent Readers iudgmēt & cenſure.

The Authors Cēſure both of the Anſwerer & Replyer.

VVHAT THE MINISTER THOMAS MORTON DOTH IN THIS REPLY and full ſatisfaction anſvvere CONCERNING *The former point of charge againſt Proteſtantes, for Rebellion, Conſpiracies, and Diſobedience; the effect wherof is drawne to three principall Queſtions.*

CHAP. IIII.

AND now after iudgment giuen of this Miniſters Reply in generall, it ſhall be needfull that we deſcend ſomewhat to particulars for proofe therof. And wheras he, by ſo many ſleightes and turninges of diuiſions and ſubdiuiſions, numbers & members of thinges to be handled, or rather hudled, as alſo by tranſmutation from due places, alteration of order, The Miniſters Sleightes.

der, clipping and culling of wordes and ſentences, endeauoreth ſo to entangle the ſight and vnderſtanding of his Reader (eſpecially the more vnlearned) as he may not eaſily finde where he walketh, nor when he anſwereth to purpoſe and when not, when he leaueth out and when he putteth in all, when he dealeth plainly and when fraudulently, and by conſequence after much reading, can ſcarce be able to make any firme concluſion at all about the matter in controuerſy: Our courſe ſhall be quyte contrary, endeauoring to bring all to breuity, perſpicuity, and certainty, ſo much as in vs lyeth, for ſo we thinke it neceſſary for the Readers true ſatisfaction, after the ſmall ſatisfaction he can receiue by the full ſatisfaction promiſed by this Miniſter.

2. Wherfore to reduce all that before hath byn ſaid by him, or his Anſwerer, or my ſelf, concerning the charge of ſedition and Rebellion, vnto ſome perſpicuous order and method, three pointes ſeeme vnto me moſt important to be conſidered in this matter, as cõprehending the ſumme & ſubſtance of all that hath byn ſaid, anſwered, or replied vpon. The firſt concerning Hereſy; the ſecond, ſeditious doctrine tending to Rebellion, and the third, the practice and exerciſe therof: wherin as in all other pointes of argument, & diſcourſe, when the obiection and ſolution is once heard, and well conſidered, no great difficulty remaineth for a diſcreet man to make the concluſion, and to ſettle his minde therin.

The firſt Queſtion about Heretickes and Hereſy. §. 1.

FIrſt then there hath byn a great contention and is betweene vs, as in the ſecond Chapter of this Treatiſe you haue heard, about the name, nature, and application of Hereſy and Heretickes; this Miniſter maketh it a principall ground in the very beginning of his firſt diſcouery, why Catholickes and Engliſh Proteſtantes may not liue togeather in one Commonwealth, without continuall feares of treaſon to be practized from the ſaid Catholicks, for that they held Proteſtantes to be Heretickes: and hereupon doth he bring in that long liſt and rablement of loſſes and penalties, both temporall and ſpirituall adiudged by ancient Councelles, and Canons Eccleſiaſticall, to be incident, and due to all ſortes of Heretickes, riſing vp againſt the Church from the beginning: whervnto his moderate Anſwerer giueth that moderate ſatisfaction, which in the precedent Chapter we haue ſignified, to wit, that concerning the execution of thoſe penalties (eſpecially the externall) it is not due againſt any vntill lawfull and iudiciall denuntiation haue paſſed; and that forſomuch as apperteined to the imputation of Hereſy vnto them that are of Caluins Religion profeſſed in England, not only Catholickes, but diuers ſortes alſo of the moſt renowned Proteſtantes did ſtand therin moſt reſolutly holding them to be true and properly Heretickes. And for this he cited many inſtances, authorities and examples; and we haue added more in the ſaid ſecond Chapter that goeth before.

4. Now then it is to be conſidered maturely without paſsion or heat of contention, whether this be ſo or not, and how T. M. doth anſwere theſe inſtances of his firſt aduerſary (for mine hitherto he hath not ſeene:) for if this be true, that indeed they are held for Heretickes by learned and graue men of their owne profeſsion, who are no leſſe oppoſite to vs then they; then falleth firſt the ground of his bitter exclamation againſt vs for reputing them ſo, & ſecondly followeth it alſo, that as great probabilities of treaſons and conſpiracies may be ſuſpected from thoſe of the other ſectes, that hold them for ſuch, (if that opinion be the cauſe of treaſons) as *Lutherans*, *Zuinglians*, *Puritans*, and the like. And laſtly enſueth a weighty conſideration, that if by all ſides they be held for Heretickes, how deeply the graue or rather grieuous aſſertion of *S. Auguſtine* before alledged is to be held in memory, & pondered with terrour. *Firmiſsimè tene & nullatenus dubites, omnem Hæreticum vel Schiſmaticum cum Diabolo & Angelis eius æterni ignis incendio participandum*: Hold for moſt certaine and no way make any doubt, but that euery Heticke or Schiſmaticke, of what ſort ſoeuer, ſhall be partaker of the flames of eternall fier, togeather with the diuell and his Angelles; which is a dreadfull ſentence, eſpecially if we remember both his and all other Holy Fathers vniforme definition of an Hereticke, to conſiſt principally in this, that he hold with obſtinacy any one article contrary to the beliefe of the vniuerſall viſible and knowne Church, for that out of theſe two maior and minor propoſitions, the concluſion is eaſily made who is an Hereticke, and therby alſo in the danger denounced by *S. Auguſtine*.

Marke theſe conſequences

Aug. de fide Cathol. citat. apud Grat. tit. 7. de Hæreticis c. 2

5. The firſt proofe then which the Anſwerer alledgeth againſt the diſcouery of T. M. in this behalfe, is the authority, cenſure and iudgment of the Deane & Colledge of the famous Lutheran Vniuerſity in *Germany*,

First charge of Hereſy laied vpon Proteſtantesby men of their owne profeſsion.

many, named *Tubinga*, ſet downe by the ſaid deane and Comon Reader of that Vniuerſity named *Philippus Nicolaus* in a large booke with this title: *Fundamentorum Caluiniana ſecta cum veteribus Arrianis & Neſtorianis communium detectio*: A diſcouery of the fundamentes of the Caluinian ſect, which are common to them with the ancient Arrians & Neſtorians: & he proueth through many Chapters togeather, that *Caluiniſts* are no leſſe Heretickes then the other, and they agree with him at leaſt in ſeauenteene or eighteene principall articles, alledging alſo *Luthers* authority to the ſame effect.

Moderate Anſvver. pag. 14.

In præfat. & cap. 1. 2 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. &c.

6. This is the charge. What doth the Miniſter now Reply vpon large and mature deliberation in this his full ſatisfaction? Yow ſhall heare it in his owne wordes: That which they did (ſaith he) in the ſpirit of oppoſition and contention is not much to be regarded: and this is all he ſaith to the purpoſe, for that preſently he runneth a ſide to proue by other meanes, that *Caluin* did not hold with the Arrians and Neſtorians; but this is to take a new contention in hand with the Vniuerſity of *Tubinga*, whether they cenſured well or no, and not to anſwere vs, whether *Caluiniſts* be truly Heretickes by the iudgment of that Proteſtant Vniuerſity, which in effect he granteth, when he ſaith: That it is not much to be regarded what they did in the ſpirit of oppoſition & contention; ſo as they cenſure him, and he cenſured them: wherby is cleer that in their iudgment, both he and his are condemned, which is the point in queſtion.

Reply pag. 17.

His ſleight anſvvere not ſatisfying the doubt.

7. And by this and many other like authorities alledged by me to this purpoſe in the precedent ſecond Chapter, is euident, that in the iudgment and conſcience of all Lutheran Proteſtantes whatſoeuer, not only in the ſpirit of oppoſition and contention, as this man ſaith, but in their calmeſt ſpirit (if euer they be in calme) all Caluiniſtes are held by them for damna-

ble Heretickes, yea, *deploratiſſimi Hæretici*, moſt deſperate Heretickes ſaith *Franciſcus Stancarus* a chief Superintendent in *Polonia: Alieni ab Eccleſia Dei, & ſatanæ membra*, ſaith *Luther* himſelf: cut of from the Church of God and therby made true members of *Satan*; which cenſure being laied vpon them by men of their owne profeſsion is a very conſiderable point to be marked by him that feareth the eternall fire before mentioned by *S. Auguſtine*. For as if ſo many learned Phiſitians ſhould tell vs that we were in a dangerous conſumption, or ſo many skilfull Lawyers ſhould admoniſh vs that we were by law in a caſe of extreme temporall danger of death, we would looke about vs: ſo much more ought we in this caſe.

Stanc l. de Trinit. & medi. Lut. li. contr. Sacra. & epiſt. ad Marchio. Pruſſ.

8. I paſſe ouer the teſtimony of *Conradus* before mentioned, who affirmeth Caluiniſtes *to belieue and teach rightly no one article of the Creed:* that alſo of *Heshuſius*, that ſaith, *their aſſociation is a moſt blaſphemous & ſacrilegious ſect:* that of *Hunnius, it is moſt damnable and the right way to hell:* that of *Schutzius*, calling it *the ſinke of all wicked Hereſies:* that of *Modeſtus, that maketh Caluiniſts as badd as Iewes and Mahometanes:* that of *Matthias, Grauerus*, and others, that affirme all Proteſtantes that follow Caluins doctrine *profeſſed enemies of Ieſus Chriſt:* al which being Miniſters, and zealous profeſſors of Luthers new Ghoſpell, cannot be imagined by Proteſtantes to haue byn ſo much abandoned by the Holy Ghoſt, as to giue this deliberate Cenſure of their brethren in profeſsion, if it were falſe, or elſe muſt we thinke, that they had neuer the true ſpirit of God in them, wherof which ſoeuer our Miniſter granteth, he is in the brakes: And thus much of Lutherane Proteſtantes.

Anſvverer pag 15. The ſecõd charge of Hereſy frõ Puritanes.

9. Next to this where the danger without cõpariſon is farre greater, the Anſwerer obiecteth to our Miniſter, the opinion of the Puritanes, to wit, the more zealous part of the *Caluinian* profeſsion it ſelf, who affirme

firme in the name of all their brethren (whome they say to be thousands) that the ordinary Protestantes of England are not only in errour and Heresy, but are plaine Infidelles; and that it is infidelity to goe to their Churches; and that it was a damnable sinne in the Parliament, yea more heinous then that of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* to cõfirme such an erroneous Religion. And the same and other like censures of theirs are related in my Lord of *Canterbury* his booke of *Dangerous positions*: and the occasion and foundation of this censure and iudgment is set downe of late very cleerly in the preface to the answere to *Syr Edward Cookes* Reports, where is shewed why (supposing the groũdes of both Religions and differences, especially in the origen of Ecclesiasticall power which giueth essence to the true Church) they cannot be but as heathens, publicans and Infidelles the one to the other.

Admonit. 2. to the Par. pa. 25. & suppl. vers. 36.

9. Now then how doe yow thinke that T. M. shifteth of this charge? No otherwise then the former, by granting the matter; but inueigheth against the men: *This writer and you (saith he) may ioine fellowship: yow dedicate your booke to the King, he to the Parliament; he pretendeth the consent of a thousand; yow of a thousand thousandes; he for all his consent is not many, and yow (for ought you will pretend) but one &c.* So he. But what is all this to the purpose? He granteth the point in question, that English Protestantes are held for Heretickes, in the science & conscience of Puritanes: so as, both by enemies and friendes, they are thought to be in an euill case. And truly this is much plainer dealing in cõfessing a truth (that they be in deed at such debate amõg themselues in the very substance and essence of their Religion) then that of Deane Sutcliffe, who hauing taken vpon him these yeares past to returne A full and round answere (for so he intituleth his booke) to the *VVarnword* of N. D. (euen as now T. M. doth his A full satisfaction)

Hovv T. M. doth shift of the Censure of the Puritanes.

The notable shifting of Deane Sutcliffe.

tisfaction) when he came to the purpoſe, he was ſo far from being full & round, as to foure whole Chapters which the other had made of this matter, to ſhew the diſſentiõ of Proteſtants among themſelues, & the condemnation of Caluiniſtes by all other Proteſtant ſectes of our time, he anſwered not twice foure lines to all the ſaid diſcourſes, teſtimonies, examples, and demonſtrations, but diſſembling al, as though no ſuch thing had byn written by his aduerſary, at laſt in the end of a Chapter, brake forth into the deniall of any ſuch different names or ſectes at all, ſaying: *Neither doe we acknowledge the names of Lutheranes, Caluiniſtes, Zuinglians or Puritanes, but only doe call our ſelues Chriſtians &c. VVe ſay further, that the Churches of Germany, France and England agree, albeit priuate men hold priuate opinions.*

Sutcliffe in his full anſvvere, part. 1. c. 1. pag. 14.

10. Thus Deane Sutcliffe: and by this audacity yow may know the Deane, for that no man els I thinke could without bluſhing haue denied the notice of ſo notorious names and differences, or ſo boldly haue affirmed that all the Proteſtant Churches of *Geneua, France* and *England* did agree, notwithſtanding that priuate men held priuate opinions; ſo as belike Churches may agree without men, to wit, in their walles and windowes: but theſe are eſcapes fit for M. Sutcliffe, and ſo to him I leaue them.

A third charge of Hereſy againſt Proteſtantes by one of their owne. Moderate Anſvver. pag. 14. M. Hugh Broughtõ.

11. But yet the moderate Anſwerer goeth one ſtep neerer vnto T.M. and telleth him that a great learned man of his owne ſide, a rare linguiſt, a long traueller, trained much in *Geneua* and other Cities of *Germany*, highly commended by *M. VVillet* in his printed workes, and admired by others; to wit, *M. Hugh Broughton* hauing conſidered well of our ordinary Proteſtantes Religion, condemned the ſame of infinite errours & Hereſies, in a certaine aduertiſement publiſhed in print, vpon the yeare of Chriſt 1604. giuing grieuous curſes of *Anathema Maranatha* to the ſame, & to diuers

Biſhops

Biſhops in particuler, as namely to *M. VVhitgift*, late Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and to *M. Bilſon* yet Biſhop of *VVinchester*, affirming further that their Bible, after their tranſlation, and by their corrupt notes thervnto, is made worſe and more dangerous then the Turkes Alcaron, and cauſeth many millions to run to eternall flames: that he hath found the text of the old Teſtament only, peruerted in eight hundred and eight and forty ſeuerall places, and other like pointes; whervnto I finde T.M. to anſwere nothing in effect touching the matter it ſelf in queſtion, either by deniall of the thing, or otherwiſe, but only aſcribing it to paſsion and lack of iudgment in him, which the other perhaps will retourne to him againe. But let vs hear our Miniſters wordes to his aduerſary.

12. *VVhat modeſty (ſaith he) can this be in you to obiect vnto vs a man whome you know to be ſequeſtred from vs, rather by impotency of paſsion, then by any difference of Religion*: And is not this a very ſubſtantiall anſwere? Is not this *a full ſatisfaction*, according to the title of his booke? and was not the cenſure of the Puritanes caſt of a little before in regard of like paſsion? And all the Lutheran Proteſtantes of *Tubinga* before that againe vpon pretence of like paſsion, as writing *in the ſpirit of contradiction and contention?* What triall, what witnes can haue place if this kind of anſwering may be admitted? But it is ſufficient to me that by confeſsion of our Miniſter himſelfe their Religion is held for error, Hereſy, and infidelity, not only by Catholickes or Papiſtes, as they call them, but alſo by Proteſtantes themſelues, both Lutheranes and Puritanes, and ſome learned alſo of their owne proper ſect, which is a pittifull confeſsion if we conſider of it well, and no leſſe diſhonorable & preiudiciall vnto them, to haue the name of Heretike aſcribed & laid vpon them, aſwell by friendes as enemies, as it is honourable and comfortable vnto vs to be cal-

Reply c.7.

T.M. cannot defend his Religion from Hereſy againſt his ovvne people.

Aug. l. de vera Religi. cap. 7.

be called Catholickes, according to *S. Augustines* obseruation, not only by freindes but also by our enemies. And thus much of the first Question.

The second Question about seditious Doctrine. §. 2.

13. ALl our contention hitherto in this point hauing byn, whether truly & really the doctrine of Catholickes or Protestantes be more peaceable, or seditious in it self, or more dãgerous or secure to Princes, concerning the obedience or Rebellion of their subiectes, whatsoeuer hath byn obiected by the accusation or calumniation of our Minister, in his former discouery against Catholickes, hath not byn any direct doctrine, teaching or insinuating, much lesse inciting subiectes to disobedience or Rebellion, as before hath byn declared, but only by a certaine consequence or inferẽce, that for so much as in certaine vrgent and exorbitant cases, we ascribe to the Christian Common-wealth and supreme Pastour therof, authority to restraine & punish supreme Magistrates in such cases; that therfore our doctrine is seditious, and tending, indirectly at least & *à longè*, to Rebellion; though the visible experience of so many great Kingdomes round about vs, lyuing for so many yeares, and sometimes ages also, in quiet security, notwithstãding this doctrine, doth conuince this to be a calumniation.

The equity of our doctrine tried by the effects

14. But our Aduersaries doe not onely teach this, *That euery Christian Common-wealth vpon mature deliberation and with generall consent hath such authority*, but further also, that particular men and Common people haue

The contrary effects of Protestant doctrine.

the

the ſame, and are not only taught, but vrged in like manner, & exhorted to vſe it, when ſoeuer they ſuppoſe their Prince to offer them iniury or hard meaſure, eſpecially in matters of Religion; wherof the moderate Anſwerer obiecteth many examples and proofes againſt T. M. taken out of their owne bookes, wordes and wrytinges, as alſo by the teſtimonies of other principall Proteſtant-writers, wherevnto though T. M. would make a ſhew to anſwere ſomewhat now in this his Reply, and therupon hath framed a ſecond ſeuerall part of his booke for iuſtificatiõ of Proteſtantes in that behalfe: yet is it ſo far of from *A full ſatisfaction* (the title of his whole worke) as in effect he confeſſeth all that his Aduerſary oppoſeth, no leſſe then yow haue heard in the former queſtion, though ſomewhat he will ſeeme ſometimes to wrangle, and to wype of the hatred of their aſſertion by Commentes of his owne deuiſe.

The vanity of this Reply.

15. And indeed what other anſwere can be framed to moſt plaine aſſertions out of their owne wordes and writinges, as of *Caluin*, *Beza*, *Hottoman*, and ſo many other French Caluiniſtes, as I haue mentioned in the firſt Chapter of this Treatiſe? *Goodman* alſo, *Gilby*, *VVhittingham*, *Knox*, *Buchanan*, and others neerer home vnto vs? All the forenamed Collections in like manner of him that is now Archbiſhop of Canterbury, of *Doctour Sutcliffe* and others, in the books intituled, *Dangerous poſitions*, *Suruey of the pretended Diſciplinary Doctrine*, and the like, wherin their poſitions are moſt cleerly ſet downe, concerning this matter. And albeit this Miniſter T. M. in his Reply, doth vſe all the art poſſible to diſſemble the ſame, by telling a peece of his Aduerſaries allegations in one place, and another peece in another, altering all order both of Chapters matter and method, ſet downe by the Anſwerer, ſo as neuer hare when ſhe would ſit, did vſe more turnin-

ges and windinges for couering her ſelfe (which the Reader may obſerue euen by the places themſelues quoted by him out of his aduerſaries booke:) yet are his anſwerers ſuch, where he doth anſwere (for to ſundry chiefe points he ſaith nothing at all) as doe eaſely ſhew that in ſubſtance he confeſſeth all and cannot deny what is obiected. And where he ſeeketh to deny any thing, there he intangleth himſelf more then if flatly he confeſſed the ſame. Some few examples I ſhall alledge wherby coniecture may be made of the reſt.

Moder. Anſwverer cap 4.

16. The Anſwerer alledgeth, firſt the wordes of *Goodman*, in his booke againſt Queen *Mary*, wherin he writeth expreſſely, that it is lawfull by Godes law and mans to kill both Kinges and Queenes, when iuſt cauſe is offered, and herſelf in particuler, for that ſhe was an enemy to God, and that all Magiſtrates and Princes tranſgreſsing Gods lawes, might by the people be puniſhed, condemned, depriued & put to death, aſwel as priuate tranſgreſſours; and much other ſuch doctrine to this effect, cited out of the ſaid *Goodman*. All which the Biſhop of *Canterbury* his ſecond booke of *Dangerous poſitions* hath much more largely, both of this *Goodman* and many other Engliſh Proteſtantes, cheife Doctours of their Primitiue Church, reſiding at that time in *Geneua*. And what doth T. M. reply now to this? Yow ſhall heare it in his owne wordes.

The doctrine of Goodman and other English Proteſtāts of Geneua

Goodman pa. 94. 119. 203. &c.

Cap. 1.

Full ſatiſfaction, part 2. pa. 103.

If I ſhould iuſtify this *Goodman* ſaith he (though your examples might excuſe him) yet my hart ſhall condemne my ſelf: But what doe yow profeſſe to proue,
» all Proteſtantes teach poſitions Rebellious? Proue it.
» Heere is one *Goodman*, who in his publicke book doth
» maintaine him: I haue no other meanes to auoid theſe
» ſtraites which yow obiect, by the example of one, to
» conclude all Proteſtants in England Rebellious; then
» by the example of all the reſt to anſwere, there is but one. So he.

17. And

17. And this is his *full satisfaction and faithfull Reply*, as he calleth his booke; but how poore satisfaction this giueth, and how many pointes there be heere of no faith or credit at all, is quickly seene by him that will examine them. For first how doe the examples alledged against this *Goodman* by the *Moderate Answerer* excuse him, as heere is said, seeing the wordes he alledgeth against him out of his owne booke are intollerable, and my Lord of *Canterbury* alledgeth farre worse? As for example, that it is most lawfull to kill wicked Kinges when they fall to Tyranny, but namely Queenes, and thervpon that Queene *Mary* ought to haue byn put to death as a Tyrant, Monster, and cruèll beast; alledging for confirmation therof diuers examples out of Holy Scripture, as that the Subiectes did lawfully kill the Queenes Highnes *Athalia*, and that the worthy Captaine *Iehu* killed the Queenes Maiesty *Iesabell*, and that *Elias*, though no Magistrate, killed the Queenes Highnes Chaplaines, the Priestes of *Baal*; and that these examples are left for our instruction &c. And now, tell me, how may these examples excuse M. *Goodman*, as our Minister *Morton* auoucheth? *Dang. poe fit. l. 2. c. 1.*

18. Secondly it is both false and fond to affirme that the moderate Answerer tooke vpon him to proue either that all Protestantes in these our dayes, doe teach such Rebellious positions, or that all Protestantes in England are Rebellious, as heere is affirmed; for that this were to deale as iniuriously with them, as they and he doe with vs, by imputing this last Rebellious fact of a few in England, to the whole sort of Catholickes and to their doctrine. It was sufficient for the Answerers purpose to shew that both *Goodman* and many others, principall pillars of the English new Ghospell in those daies, did hold, belieue, and practice those positions out of the true spirit of the said Ghospell. And herevpon thirdly it followeth, that it is a

A shameles aſſertion of T. M. denying a manifeſt truth.

notorious impudency to auouch with ſuch reſolutiõ, as this man doth, that there is but this one of that opinion, *and that one dram of droſſe (as he ſaith) proueth not the whole maſſe to be no gold.* For who knoweth not firſt, that *VVhittingam*, afterward Deane of *Durham*, approued and made a preface to *Goodmans* booke, commending highly the ſaid doctrine? *Gilby* alſo another of that primitiue *Geneuian* Church, who is thought by ſome to haue byn the Author of the famous ſeditious booke, intituled, *Of Obedience* (he ſhould haue ſaid *Of Rebellion* ſaith my Lord of *Canterbury*) which booke approueth and commendeth the ſame doctrine moſt highly, as the ſaid Lord teſtifieth at large, by ſetting downe their poſitions, and then addeth as followeth about the conſent of others.

„ 19. *Goodman* (ſaith he) for his concluſion is moſt
„ earneſt with all Engliſh ſubiectes, that they would
The B. of Cant. his teſtimony of the primitiue English Geneuiãs. dan. poſit. pag. 218. 219. 220. 221.

put his doctrine in practice, aſſuring them that in ſo doing, if they be caſt into priſon with *Ioſeph*, to wilde beaſtes with *Daniel*, into the ſea with *Ionæ*, into the dungeon with *Ieremy*, into the fiery fornace with *Sydrach*, *Myſaach*, and *Abdenago*: yet they ſhalbe comforted. Wheras if they will not, in ſeeking to ſaue their liues, they ſhall looſe them; they ſhall be caſt out of the fauour of God; their conſciences ſhalbe wounded with hell-like tormentes; they ſhall deſpaire and ſeeke to hang themſelues with *Iudas*; to murder themſelues with *Franciſcus Spira*; drowne themſelues with Iudge *Hales*; or els fall madde with Iuſtice *Morgan* &c. At *Geneua* &c.

In his preface to Goodmãs booke.

20. This doctrine, ſaith *VVhittingham*, was approued by the beſt learned in theſe partes, meaning *Caluin* & the reſt of the *Geneuians*. The Engliſh men of name there at that time beſides *Goodman* and *VVhittingham*, were (as I take it) *Antony Gilby*, *Miles Couerdale*, *Dauid VVhitehead*, and ſundry others, who liking the ſaid doctrine

ctrine alſo exceedingly, were very earneſt to haue the ſame printed for the benefit, as they ſaid, of their Brethren in England. *Whittingham* made a preface to *Goodmans* booke, wherin he greatly commendeth this doctrine, and writeth thus in the name as it ſeemeth of all his fellowes there: *We deſire that yow* (meaning all in England and elſwhere) *that loue to know the truth and follow it, should be perſwaded in this truth* (to wit of deposing Princes that follow not their Ghoſpell.) And yet further: *Heere thou doſt heare the eternall ſpeaking of his Miniſter &c. quickly giue eare and obey &c.* And againe: *If thou wish for Chriſtian liberty come and ſee how it may eaſely be had &c.* From *Geneua &c.* So he.

21. Wherby may be ſeene that there was more then one dram of droſſe in that golden maſſe, if euery one of theſe firſt Geneuian Ghoſpellers weighed a dram; and by this may be ſeene alſo, what credit may be giuen to theſe Miniſters aſſeuerations, that ſo guilefully doe affirme or deny what maketh for their purpoſes, without ſcruple of lying, euen then whē they ſpeake againſt Equiuocation. For it was impoſsible, but that T. M. knew this to be ſo, when he auouched the contrary, *that Goodman was alone in this caſe*; and how then could he write and print it, except either by ſecret Equiuocation, or manifeſt lying?

22. Nor is it much to the purpoſe, to ſay, that Engliſh Proteſtants doe not now profeſſe thoſe poſitions of *Goodman* and the reſt of thoſe ancient daies. for that the times and ſtate of thinges be changed and bettered with them; for they are not vnder Princes that preſſe them to matters againſt their willes. But yet we muſt imagine, that thoſe who had *Primitias Spiritus*, the very firſt fruites and greateſt feruour of that new Ghoſpelling-ſpirit, did ſpeake and write more properly out of the force and inſtinct of that ſpirit, according to the nature and eſſence therof, then theſe

An euaſiō taken avvay.

later, who accommodate themſelues to the condition of ſtates and times; and that theſe now would fall to that alſo, if they were in their caſe.

Their ſedicious doctrine againſt Q. Elizabeth.

23. For proofe wherof the moderate anſwerer citeth diuers like Rebellious aſſertions, ſet downe by ſuch as eſteeme themſelues the purer ſort of Proteſtantes, againſt Queene *Elizabeth* alſo, though a Proteſtant Princeſſe, when ſhee preſſed them in matters cõcerning their Religion; in which poſitions they affirme: *That she was worſe and leſſe tolerable then her ſiſter Queene Mary, and not to be obeied in her procedinges againſt them*; yea openly they moued diuers Magiſtrates to take armes againſt her, and namely in the marches of *VVales*, as appeareth yet by their ſupplications to the Gouernour of that countrey. He obiecteth in like manner the publicke poſitions, and printed doctrine of *Buchanan*, *Knox*, and other chiefe Miniſters and preachers of *Scotland*, about the very ſame times, who publickly and reſolutely giue authority to the people, to pull downe, puniſh, & depriue Princes, aſwell of their Crownes, as alſo of their liues when they think them worthy; yea, do allow publicke rewardes to be propoſed to ſuch as kill euil Princes, no leſſe then to them that deſtroy noiſome beaſtes, as rauenous wolues, beares, and the like. He addeth moreouer out of the very notes of our moderne Proteſtantes vpon the Bible, euen by the iudgment and interpretation of his Maieſty himſelf, in the late conference with the Puritanes, that depoſing and killing of Princes is allowed, out of their expoſition of Scriptures, for lawfull in ſuch caſes, as they goe againſt Religion; which cenſure to be conforme to the iudgment and writinges both of *Luther*, *Zuinglius* and *Caluin*, he ſheweth by quoting their wordes and works in ſundry places, which for breuity I pretermit.

Dan. poſit pag. 18. 133 134 ſuppl. to the gouernour of VVales p. 16. 36. 37. 38.

Mod. anſ. cap. 4.

Poſitions of Scottiſh Miniſters.

Knox in Hiſt. p. 372 item to Engl. and Scotland f 78. Buchanan de Iure Reg. p. 13. 25. 40. 58. 61.

Cap. 2. §. Contrarywiſe.

24. And what doth T.M. anſwere to all this thinke yow?

yow? Yow shall heare part by part according as before the obiections haue byn set downe. To the first about Puritans, I finde no answere at al, so as in this, I see not how his satisfaction may be called *full*, for so much as it is quite nothing: To *Knox* & *Bucchanan* their assertions, he answereth thus: You might haue added, *that there was in Scotland an act of Parliament to call in that Cronicle of Buchanan, censuring all such contemptes and innouations*, and then citeth in the margent anno 1584. which was almost thirty yeares after the said doctrine had byn taught, preached, and practised in that Kingdome, by those first Ghospellers. And is not this *A full satisfaction* trow yow? What if the Cronicle of *Buchanan* were called in, that recounted with approbation and insolent triumph the attemptes made vpō their lawfull Princes, by incitation of this doctrine? Doth this take away the doctrine it self? Or doth it proue that those first Ghospellers held it not? What became of the other bookes of *Knox*, and namely his Cronicle (for he wrote also a Cronicle of the same matters, and of his owne actes therin, as *Cæsar* did his Commentaries) were they abolished hereby? Or doe not the same thinges remaine in *Holinshed*, *Hooker*, *Harison*, *Thyn*, and other writers aswell English as Scottish? Or doth all this proue that this was not their doctrine? See then how *full* or rather *fond* this satisfaction is.

How fully T. M. answereth matters & giueth satisfaction.

Reply pa. 107.

To the obiection about Knox & Buchanans doctrine.

25. As for the iudgment and testimony of his Maiesty, about the notes of English Ministers vpon the Bible, allowing it for lawfull in certaine cases to depose and kill Princes, he answereth thus: *It will be requisite without preiudice to the most learned and Religious iudgment of his Maiesty to satisfy for two places related from that conference &c.* And then he passeth on to discourse at large of the meaning of those places, and vnder the colour of the forefaid honorable preface, he taketh licence

Reply pa. 103.

To the obiection of his Maiesties iudgmēt about the English Ministers notes vpō the Bible.

cence to diſſent from his Maieſty, ſignifying in effect that either the conference was not well related, or his Maieſty miſtooke their meaning in thoſe notes; and yet is the matter cleere by his owne confeſsion, that their ſaid notes vpon the ſecond booke of Cronicles, and 15. Chapter verſ. 16. doe not only allow the deposing of the Queene *Maacha* by her ſonne King *Aſa*, for Idolatry, but further doe reprehēd him alſo ſharply for that he had not put her to death by fier, ſaying thus in their note: *That whether she were Mother or Grandmother, yet herin the King shewed that he lacked zeale; for she ought to haue byn burnt by the couenant, as verſ. 13. appeareth, & by the law of God Deuteronomy 13. but he gaue place to foolish pitty, and would alſo ſeeme after a ſort to ſatiſfy the law.* So they in their note.

26. But who will looke vpon the two textes of Scripture by them heere cited, ſhall finde no mention of burning, but only of putting to death, and in *Deut.* of ſtoning only. But how doth he now defend this note of our Engliſh Miniſters, allowing the depoſition and putting to death of Princes? Yow ſhall heare his ſhift (for he is much troubled with his Maieſties obſeruation:) *VVhat shall we ſay then?* (ſaith he) *is the Soueraignty of Kinges diſabled? God forbid; but it is rather eſtablished therby, for the King is made the depoſer, yea euen of whoſoeuer.* Doe yow ſee his poore flattering ſhift? If the Queene *Maacha* might be depoſed according to their note, and that *ex Auguſto Imperio*, from her Imperiall gouernment, as the text of Scripture hath, yea and that ſhe ought according to the law of God to haue byn put to death, as now hath byn ſaid, for her Idolatry, then is it a poore ſhift to ſay that Kinges cannot be depoſed, for that they muſt be the depoſers, ſeing that in *Deut.* where the Commiſsion is giuen, there is no mention of Kinges at all, but Gods ſpeach & commiſsion there is vnto the people: *Si tibi voluerit perſuadere*

Marke his poore shift.

2. Par. 15.

dere frater tuus &c. If thy brother, or wife, or friend will perſwade thee to leaue God let thy hand be vpon him, and after thee the hand of all the people; which notwithſtanding is to be vnderſtood as before in the ſecond Chapter we haue noted, both out of the 13. & 17. Chapters of *Deut.* and the gloſſe therevpon, according to the order there ſet downe, to wit, after the cauſe examined & ſentenced by lawfull Iudges. And at this time when this law was ordained, there were no Kinges in *Iſrael*, nor in many yeares after, and conſequently this commiſsion could not be giuen to Kinges only.

Not only Kings by Gods law appointed depoſers as the Miniſter T. M. ſaith.

27. So then for ſo much as Engliſh Proteſtant-Miniſters that made theſe notes, doe authorize by this place of *Deut.* the depoſing and killing of that Imperiall Queene; his Maieſties cenſure was iudicious, & true, that therby they allowed that lawfull Princes might be in certaines caſes depoſed and put to death. And the firſt ſhift of T. M. in this place is ridiculous, wherby he would ſeeme to make ſecure al Kinges from danger of depoſition, for that themſelues by Godes word (which yet he proueth not) muſt be the depoſers, and then he preſumeth they will not depoſe themſelues; but for Queenes he leaueth them to ſhift as they may: Which doctrine I ſuppoſe he would not haue ſet forth in print in the late Queenes daies. But their aſſertions are according to times and places: and ſo this ſhall be ſufficient for the ſecond Queſtion.

The third Queſtion concerning practice of Rebellion. §. 3.

28. AND now hauing byn lõger in the former two Queſtions, then in the beginning was purpoſed, I ſhall endeauour to be ſhorter, if it may be, in this laſt, though the multitude of examples, partly ſet downe by vs before in the firſt Chapter of this Treatiſe, and partly to be read in Hiſtories and obſerued by experience of Proteſtantes continuall tumultuation againſt Catholicke Princes, would require a larger diſcuſsion, then both the other two Queſtions put togeather: albeit on the other ſide againe the matters are ſo cleere as they need no diſcuſsion at all, but only narration. For what can our Miniſter anſwere in reaſon or truth, to all that multitude of inſtances of Proteſtantes Rebellions, in the foreſaid firſt Chapter ſet downe, and for the moſt part obiected before (as now I perceiue) by his aduerſary, the moderate Anſwerer? We ſhall briefly runne ouer ſome few examples.

Reply pag. 101.

29. To the inſtances in England of continuall conſpiracies and inſurrections againſt Queene *Mary*, he ſetteth downe firſt this bold and ſhameles prouocation. *After the proclamation of her title* (ſaith he) *ſhew vs what Proteſtant euer reſiſted? what Miniſter of the Ghoſpell in all that fiery triall did kindle the leaſt ſpark of ſedition among her people?* In which wordes is to be obſerued, firſt that he ſaith, *after the Proclamation of her title*, to excuſe therby the Dukes of *Northumberland* and *Suffolke*, the Marques of *Northampton*, and others that tooke armes againſt her, before ſhee was proclaimed in *London*, though

To the Rebelliõs againſt Q. Mary vvhat he anſvveteth.

though in *Norfolke* she had proclaimed her self presently vpon the death of her brother King *Edward*: as also to excuse *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *Sandes*, *Latimer*, *Rogers*, *Iewell*, and other Ministers that had preached most bitterly against her title. But what, is the residue true, that heere so boldly he auoucheth, *that neuer any Protestant resisted, nor Minister kindled the least spark of sedition among her people after her title proclaimed?* Is this true I say? Is this iustifiable (for he calleth this Treatise a iustification of Protestantes?) Is this any way to be maintained by any shew or shift whatsoeuer? What then wil he say to the new conspiracy and iterated Rebellion of the Duke of *Suffolke*, & of his brother the Lord *Iohn Grey*, not only after the said Queenes title proclaimed, but after she was in possession, and had pardoned them both of their former Rebellion? What will he say to the Rebellion of *Syr Peter Carew*, *Syr Gawyn Carew*, *Syr Thomas Denny*, & other Protestant Gentlemen, that tooke armes in *Deuonshire* within six daies (saith Stow) after the arraignemẽt of the Duke of *Northumberland?* What wil he say to the conspiracy of *Syr Iames a Croftes* & others in *VVales*, discouered (saith the same Authour) about the fiue and twentith day of Ianuary next ensuing? What will he say to the Rebellion of *Syr Thomas VVyat* and his confederates in *Kent* ensuing about the same time? Were they not Protestantes that were authors therof? Or was not Queene *Maries* title yet proclaimed? Will our Minister face out this? What will he say to the cõspiracies ensuing after this againe, from *Syr Edward Courtney* Earle of *Deuonshire*, *Syr Nicolas Throckmorton*, & others? what to the conspiracy of *VVilliam Thomas*, who hauing determined and plotted the murder of the said Queene, and conuicted therof, professed (saith *Stow*) at his death at *Tyburne*, that he died for his countrey?

Stovv, Holinshead, & others in their Cronicles

Many cleere exãples to cõuince T. M.

Stovv. an. 1554. May 18.

30. I passe ouer other conspiracies and Rebellions,

as that of *Vdall Throckmorton, Iohn Daniel, Stanton, Cleber*, the three *Lincolnes*, and after them *Thomas Stafford*, and others, that comming out of *France* with instructions of the brethren of *Geneua*, surprised *Scarborough* Castle, made proclamations against the Queene, that she was iustly deposed, and other such like attemptes by that sort of people, who all professed themselues to be Protestantes, and to haue entred into those affaires principally for their Religion: And with what face or forhead then doth T. M. say in this place? *Shew vs what Protestant euer resisted? &c.*

Diuers other insurrections.

31. But much more impudent is the second part of his assertion about Ministers, saying: *That no Minister of the Ghospell did euer kindle the least spark of sedition against Queene Mary*: Wheras his aduersary obiecteth many by name, as *Cranmer, Ridley, Rogers*, and *Iewel* before mentioned, who as is euident by *Fox* his story in his Actes and Monumentes, both dealt, preached & stirred people against her, all that lay in their power. And as for *Cranmer*, it is euident he was condemned for the same treason in Parlament: *Ridley* preached openly at *Paules* Crosse against her title: *Rogers* at Gloceſter: and *Iewel* was appointed to preach in *Oxford*, had he not byn preuented by the sudden and vnexpected proclayming of the said Queene there by *Syr Iohn VVilliams* & others.

Stirres & conspiracies by Ministers.

32. The instances also that we haue alledged of *Goodman, VVhittingham, Gilby, Couerdale, VVitehead*, & sundry others testified by my Lord of *Canterbury*, to haue taught and practized sedition against the said Queene in those daies, doe they not conuince this Minister *Thomas Morton* of rare & singular impudency? will any man euer belieue him hereafter what he saith or affirmeth, denieth or shifteth of, seing him to auouch so manifest vntruthes, as these are, with so shameles asseueration?

33. But yet to conuince him somewhat more, I thinke

think good to ſet downe ſome of the particuler wordes and phraſes of two or three of the principall forenamed pillars of the Proteſtant primitiue Church in our Iland (omitted for breuities ſake by the moderate Anſwerer) to the end yow may ſee their ſpirit,& iudge of this mans forehead in ſtanding ſo reſolutely in the deniall taken in hand. For firſt *Iohn Knox*, in a booke written & printed at *Geneua* 1558. which was the laſt of her raigne; wherin after he had ſaid, *That is is not birth only or propinquity of bloud that maketh a King lawfull to raigne aboue the people profeſſing Ieſus Chriſt &c.* He goeth forward, ſaying thus: I feare not to affirme that it had byn the duty of the Nobility, Iudges, Rulers and people of England, not only to haue reſiſted and withſtood *Mary* that *Iezabel*, whome they called their Queene; but alſo to haue puniſhed her to death, with all the ſort of her Idolatrous Prieſtes, togeather with all ſuch as ſhould haue aſsiſted her &c. Doe yow ſee here his Euangelicall ſpirit? Doe yow ſee the eſſence of his doctrine? Doe yow heare this new Prophet declare himſelf cleerly? But let vs giue audience to another of like vocation and ſpirit.

More exãples of Miniſters treaſons againſt Q. Mary.

Knox in his exhort. to the Nobility fol. 63. & 77.

» » » » »

34. The ſecond is his deere brother *Chriſtophor Goodman*, who in a booke of his printed alſo at *Geneua* the ſame yeare 1558. the title wherof was, *How Superiours ought to be obeyed*, writeth thus: I know yow of England will ſay that the Crowne is not entailed to heire-males, but appertaineth aſwell to the daughters, & therfore by the lawes of the Realme ye could doe no otherwiſe then admit her; but if this be true, yet miſerable is the anſwere of ſuch as had ſo long time profeſſed the Ghoſpell, and the liuely word of God. For if it had byn done by Pagans and heathens, which knew not God by his word, it might better haue byn borne with all, but among them that beare the name of Godes people, with whome his lawes ſhould haue

Goodman in his booke, how Superiours ought to be obeied. c. 3. fol. 54.

» » » Princes to be depoſed by the liuely vvord of God.

„ chief authority, this anſwere is not tolerable. If ſhe
„ had byn no baſtard but the Kinges daughter, as law-
„ fully begotten, as was her ſiſter, that Godly Lady and
„ meeke lambe; yet at the death of our lawfull Prince
„ King *Edward*, that ſhould not haue byn your firſt coũ-
„ ſaile or queſtion, who ſhould be your Queene, but firſt
„ and principally who had byn moſt meet among your
„ Brethren to haue had the gouernment ouer yow. For
„ a woman to raigne Godes law forbiddeth, whoſe
„ raigne was neuer accompted lawfull by the word of
God &c. So he. And behold heere now whether theſe mens worde of God did not ſerue them to all turnes, euen to barre lawfull ſucceſsion, to depoſe the poſſeſſor, and whatſoeuer themſelues liſted.

35. The third Doctor of this learning was *M. VVhittingham*, Deane afterwardes (for his good merittes) of *Durham*, who made a preface to the foreſaid booke of *Goodman*, allowing and commending the ſame highly, as a thing conſulted, examined & approued by *Caluin*, and the reſt of the moſt learned Ghoſpellers of *Geneua*, for thus he writeth: *M. Chriſtophor Goodman* conferred his articles and cheif propoſitions of his booke with the beſt learned in theſe partes, who approuing the ſame, he conſented to enlarge the ſaid worke, and ſo
„ to print it as a token of his duety and good affection
„ towardes the Church of God: and then if it were
„ thought good in the iudgment of the Godly to tranſ-
„ late the ſame into other languages, that the profit
„ therof might be more vniuerſall. So *VVhittingham*; with whom concurred in iudgment *VVhithead*, *Couerdale*, *Gilby*, and others then liuing in *Geneua*, which *Gilby* wrote alſo of the like argument a ſpeciall admonition to the Realmes of England and Scotland, to call them to repentãce by all likelyhood, for that they had admitted, tolerated, and not put to death Q. *Mary* of England, and not yet depoſed, as after they did, Q. *Mary*

M. VVhittingham in his preface to Goodmãs booke.

Gilby in Admon. pag. 69.

Mary of Scotland both Mother and daughter; and the booke was printed the ſame yeare by the ſame *Criſpin* in *Geneua*: wherin beſides that which he vttereth againſt this Queene *Mary* as a Catholicke Princeſſe, or rather no Princeſſe in his opinion, he hath theſe wordes alſo of King *Henry* her Father, euen after his fall from Catholicke Religion: *The boare was buſy wrooting & digging in the earth with all his pigges that followed him, but they ſought only for the pleaſant fruites that they winded with their long ſnowtes, and for their owne bellies ſake &c. This monſtrous boare for all this, muſt needes be called head of the Church vnder paine of treaſon, diſplacing Chriſt our only head, who alone ought to haue this title.* So Gilby. And for that all this was ſpoken, written, and printed diuers yeares after Q. *Mary* was proclaimed, and inſtalled Queene, and all tending euidently to ſedition as yow ſee; (beſides the flat deniall both of King, and Queenes ſupremacy) it conuinceth plainly that which our Miniſter T. M. before denied. And ſo with this conuiction in the ſight of all his Brethren we leaue him. But yet let vs heare what he ſaith to ſome other particulers before by vs obiected.

Gilbyes immodeſt ſpeech againſt K. Henry and the ſupremacy.

36. To that then of *Syr Thomas VVyat*, the Duke of *Suffolke*, and others he anſwereth diuerſly. Firſt *the Hiſtory relateth* (ſaith he) *the pretence of VVyat thus: A proclamation againſt the Queenes marriage deſiring all Engliſhmen to ioine for defence of the Realme &c.* then that in *Queene Maries oration againſt VVyat, there is not to be fond* (ſaith he,) *any ſcruple concerning the cauſe of Religion:* thirdly *that no Miniſter of the Ghoſpell was brought in queſtion as a Commotioner in that cauſe*: Laſtly, *if intent might anſwere for Proteſtantes accuſed in that name; then is it plaine, that it was not Religion: If for VVyat and his fellowes; it is plaine it was not againſt the Queene or State, but for both.* So he. In all which different clauſes of his anſwer, conſider if any one be in it ſelf true, for as for the firſt and ſecond, though

VVyat

VVyat pretendeth in his proclamation the ſaid marriage with *Spaine* to be the chiefe cauſe; yet not alone, but that the Queene and Counſell (ſaith *Fox*) would alſo by this marriage as he affirmed bring vpon the Realme miſerable ſeruitude, and eſtabliſhe Popiſh Religion.

Fox in an. 1554. pag. 1289.

37. And the ſame *Fox* relateth Queene *Maries* wordes in her oration thus: *That the matter of the marriage is but a Spanish cloake (ſaith shee) to couer their pretenſed purpoſe againſt our Religion.* So as in theſe two pointes the Miniſter lieth openly, but more in the laſt, *that VVyats attempt was not againſt Queene Mary or the ſtate, but for both,* for that Queene Mary in the ſame oration, as both *Fox* and *Holinshead* doe iointly relate, affirmed *VVyats* anſwere to haue byn to *Syr Edward Haſtinges*, and *Syr Thomas Corn-wallis* ſent from her vnto them, which he alſo at his arraignment confeſſed, *that he and his would haue the gouernance of her perſon, the keeping of the Tower, and the placing of her Counſellours.* And as for the other point, whether any Miniſters were called in queſtion as Commotioners in that attempt, importeth little, for ſo much as no man can doubt but that the Commotion being ſo generall and for Religion, as *Fox* affirmeth, all Miniſters hartes and tongues were therin in ſecret, and their handes in like manner ſo far forth as they durſt; which being well knowne to Queene *Mary* & her Counſell, cauſed them to proceed againſt the principall ſoone after in matter of Religion, preferring therin the iniury done to God before the iniuries offered to her ſelf: though Doctor *Sanders* doe affirme that diuers chiefe of the new Clergy, & amõg them Doctor *Cranmer*, were conuinced to haue conſpired in that Rebellion. And by this we ſee how well the Miniſter hath iuſtified his Proteſtantes in this point: It is euen as good as their iuſtification by only faith, which maketh them leſſe iuſtifiable then before.

The preences of Syr Tho. VVyat.

Sande. l. 2 de Schiſ. p. 332.

before. Let vs paſſe to ſome other examples and ſe what he ſaith to the Rebellion of Proteſtantes in other countreys.

38. To that which hath byn propoſed of Scotland, both by the moderate Anſwerer and by my ſelf alſo in my firſt Chapter of this Treatiſe, of ſo great and intolerable inſolencies vſed in Scotland by Proteſtant-Miniſters and their Diſciples againſt Grand-mother, Mother, Father and ſonne, all lawfull Princes violated by them, he yeeldeth no other anſwer or ſatisfaction, but that which before hath byn recited, that in a Parlament vpon the yeare 1584. the Chronicle of *Buchanan* was called in by the ſaid Parlament (the Kinges highnes then being about eighteene yeares old.) But what is this to the purpoſe? Did this alter their doctrine or manner of Rebellious proceeding therevpon, which they had vſed both againſt his Maieſty in the time of his minority and againſt his Mother and Grand-mother before him, and againſt him after this Statute publiſhed? No truly, but they were more earneſt in their ſedition afterward then before, for that the very next yeare after, they cauſed that notorious ſurpriſe to be made vpon his Royall perſon at *Striueling* before mentioned in the firſt Chapter of this Treatiſe.

Reply pa. 107.

No ſubſtantiall anſwvering to any thing.

39. *Iames Gibſon* alſo one of the chief Miniſters being called before his Maieſty and priuy Counſell vpon the one and twentith of December 1585. vſed intollerable ſpeech vnto his highnes, calling him Perſecutour, and comparing him to *Ieroboam*, threating his rooting out and the like, which his Maieſty can beſt remember: So as ſuch doctrine, and ſuch practice being held by them & their new Ghoſpelling Brethren of Scotland in thoſe dayes, it is a ſimple ſatisfaction for our Miniſter to come forth now with a reuocation of *Buchanans* Chronicle, as though that did remedy the

Dang. poſit. l. 1. c. 6.

matter, or as though that reuocation had byn made by them (I meane the Miniſters repentant for their former doctrine) and not rather by the Ciuill Magiſtrate, impugned and reſiſted by the other. And this for the preſent of Scotland.

To the examples of France.

40. To the examples of *France* alledged by the Anſwerer of infinite rebellions made by the Proteſtants, for many yeares togeather againſt ſundry Crowned Princes of that Realm, of which attempts many were ſo barbarous, as without horrour they cannot be vttered: And one French writer affirmeth that within the compaſſe of one yeare, which was 1562. two and fourty thouſand Prieſtes, Religious, and Eccleſiaſticall perſons were moſt deſperately murdered, aboue twenty thouſand Churches caſt on the grounde, and within the compaſſe of ten yeares by the witnes of a Proteſtant writer *Colignius*, two millions of men were ſlaine, two thouſand Monaſteries ouerthrowne, nine hundred hoſpitalles deſtroyed, & aboue two hundred Citties & Caſtelles ruined vnder one only K. *Henry* the third. To all this (I ſay) he anſwereth that according to the Hiſtoricall Collections, which he hath ſeene of French affaires, the fault of all this, is to be laid vpon the houſe of *Guiſe*, who being ſtrangers, ſought to ſuppreſſe the natural Princes of the bloud Royal in *France*, as alſo to oppreſſe the Ghoſpellers: But ſuppoſe this were true, which I hold to be moſt falſe & ſlaũderous yet could not this particuler paſsion of the houſe of *Guiſe* make lawfull the Proteſtants Rebellion againſt their naturall & lawfull Kinges, no more then if now in England the Catholikes or Puritanes ſhould rebell againſt his Maieſty, for that ſome noble man or men of the Counſell were knowne to be their enemies.

Vide Lodouicum Richome in expoſt. apolog. ca. 94.

A vaine ſhift.

To the examples of Geneua

41. To the examples of *Caluin* and *Beza* in *Geneua*, both for doctrine and practize, he anſwereth firſt for doctrine, granting *Caluins* ſentence to be: *That when a*

King

King vſurpeth Gods throne he looſeth his Royalty. And againe: *If the King exalt himſelf to Godes throne and commaundeth any thing* contra Deum *againſt God, then to pull him downe.* Reply pa. 116. Moreouer he granteth that *Caluin* vſeth this phraſe; *That when a King doth ſo behaue himſelf, we muſt ſpit in his face, which is ſpoken,* ſaith our Miniſter, *comparatiuely, and not Rebelliouſly:* He expoundeth alſo thoſe wordes of *Caluin*; *Abdicant ſe poteſtate, that ſuch Kinges are bereaued of authority*; meaning only (ſaith he) in that caſe of contradiction againſt God. Ibid. pag. 119. But let the Miniſter tell vs, who ſhall be Iudge of this, who ſhall determine the caſe? To whome ſhall it belong to giue ſentẽce, when a King doth contradict God, when he vſurpeth Gods throne, when he commaundeth any thing againſt God, and conſequently, when his face muſt be ſpitten on, when he muſt be pulled downe, & when he muſt be depriued of all regall authority? Did *Thomas Morton* euer finde in any Catholicke writer ſuch wordes, or ſenſe in preiudice of Princes? And yet the fond Miniſter, as though he had plaied worthily his Maſterprize vaunteth in theſe wordes: *Thus is Caluin iuſtified concerning his doctrine, and in him alſo Beza: bycauſe Beza* (ſay yow) *his Succeſſour in place ſucceeded him alſo both in opinion and practice.* True Sir: they are both iuſtified in your manner of iuſtification, & they are fit iuſtified Saints for your Calendar.

42. And hauing ſaid thus, he paſſeth yet further, adding a ſecond prouocation about practice in theſe wordes: *VVe haue heard of their opinion* (to wit of *Caluin* and *Beza*) *haue yow any thing to except againſt their practice:* Reply pa. 19. And this demaund he made, when he knew and had ſeene his Aduerſaries many and moſt grieuous accuſations againſt them in that kinde, not only for mouing that people of *Geneua* to open Rebellion againſt their Lord and Prince the Biſhop; but alſo the people of *France*, againſt their King and Soueraigne, citing Mod. Anſvver. c. 9.

good authorities for the ſame, ſaying: *Caluin and Beza armed the ſubiectes againſt their Prince of* Geneua, *and* (as *Caluin* himſelf, Doctour *Sutcliffe*, & the Biſhop of *Canterbury* be witneſſes) *depoſed their Soueraigne from his temporall right, and euer after continued in that ſtate of Rebellion; They celebrated alſo a Councell, wherin was concluded that King Francis the ſecond, then King of Fraunce, his wife the Queene, his Children, Queene Mother &c. should be deſtroyed:* And his quotations for theſe thinges are: *Beza l. de iure Magiſtrat; Sutcliffe anſw. to ſuppl. and Suruey, Caluin in epiſt. Pet. Far. orat. cont. Sectar. defens. Reg. & Relig. &t.* All which being ſeene by our Miniſter, he demandeth notwithſtanding as yow haue heard with this hypocriſy, *haue yow any thing to except againſt their practice?* As though there were nothing at all, not only not to be accuſed or reprehended in them, but not ſo much as to be excepted againſt: And is not this notable diſsimulation in a matter ſo cleere and euident? Who can belieue this Miniſter at his word herafter? But let vs now ſee how he will anſwere the matter it ſelf obiected, and then will yow admire his impudency much more.

Great hypocriſy in the demaund of T.M.

43. For better vnderſtanding wherof yow muſt know, that beſides al that which is alledged for proofe of this accuſation out of *Caluin* & *Farellus* their owne Lordes, and my Lord of *Canterbury* his booke of *Dangerous poſitions*, Doctour *Sutcliffe* doth of purpoſe, and at large proue the ſame in two whole Chapters, to wit the ſecond and third of his *Suruey againſt the pretended diſcipline*; ſhewing out of diuers authors, and namely *Franciſcus Boninardus*, that wrote the Hiſtory of *Geneua* (as he ſaith) by *Caluins* direction, *Symlerus* and *Bodinus*; that for aboue fiue hundred yeares gone the Biſhop of *Geneua* was not only ſpirituall, but temporall Lord alſo of that Citty, and the ſame confirmed vnto him by the Emperour *Frederick* the firſt, vpon the yeare of Chriſt

Biſhop of Geneua vvas Lord temporall alſo of the Citty.

Christ 1124. and, as *Caluin* himself confesseth in his writinges to *Cardinall Sadoletus*, had *Ius gladij & alias ciuilis iurisdictionis partes*, the power of life and death and other partes of ciuill iurisdiction; and that this Prince and Bishop was cast out by the people vpon the preachinges and practises of *Farellus*, *Caluin*, and other Protestant Ministers: *Quo electo* (saith *Bodinus*,) *Geneuates Monarchiam in popularem statum commutârunt*: who being cast out, the *Geneuians* did change their Monarchy into a popular State.

Caluin to Sadolet. p. 171.

Bodinus l. de Repub. pag. 353.

44. And finally after many proofes Doctour *Sutcliffe* setteth downe his opinion in these wordes: I doubt not but that I may presume, without any mans iust offence, to speake my opinion as touching the deuinity which was pretended by the said Ministers of *Geneua* against their Bishop; for indeed I doe dislike it. If such dealinges were simply to be vrged by the word of God, they might reach further then would be conueniēt. I neuer thought it agreable to deuinity, for Ministers to cast of their Rulers at their owne pleasures; one of them writeth thus: *That the light of the Ghospell had restored to the Citty that principality which the Bishop had before*; But all the learned deuines in *Germany* at their conferences with the Emperour, were of a contrary opinion &c. I am not the man that will either iustify mine owne discretiō, or impugne any thing which may be brought for the ciuil proceeding of that State, or any other, so as they carry no false groundes of deuinity with them, which may proue dāgerous to our owne, such as haue byn since published for the authorizing of subiectes in many cases to depose their Princes. So he.

Sutcliffe in Suric. pag. 14.

D Sutcliffs testimony of Protestants doctrine for deposing of Princes

45. And now by this large discourse, yow see fully his minde, first that the Bishop of *Geneua* was Lord, and Prince of that Citty for diuers ages, confirmed also by the Emperour: secondly that he was vniustly

depriued by the people, vpon the preaching and falſe groundes of deuinity of *Farellus*, *Caluin*, *Beza*, and other Proteſtant preachers: thirdly we ſee the reaſon why he thinketh thus; *leaſt their doctrine might reach further then would be conuenient, and be dangerous in England*: So as he alſo (as yow ſee) doth accommodate his doctrine and groundes of deuinity, to the commodity of his cauſe.

46. But now let vs ſee how this Miniſter *Sutcliffe*, and our Miniſter *Morton* haue agreed togeather, vpon a farre different manner of anſwering this matter at this time, and yow will perceiue therby what people they are who change their anſweres as time and wether walketh. For after that *Morton* had read all this in *Sutcliffe*, & yet made the matter ſo ſtrãge, as by his former demaund you haue heard, when he ſaid: & haue yow any thing to except againſt their practice? Now heere he anſwereth after another faſhion thus: *The booke* (ſaith he) *of Doctour Sutcliffe, I could not finde, and I needed not ſeeke it, for I haue conferred with the Maſter, who anſwered me, that the booke De iure Magiſtratus he neuer thought to be Beza his worke, and concerning the State of Geneua, and Bishop therof, he was neuer their Prince, but the State of the towne was a free State of it ſelf: and now to make a queſtion whether I should belieue him, or yow, is to doubt whether he that hath byn at Geneua, or he that neuer ſaw it can better report the ſtate therof, the concluſion will be that yow may rather proue thoſe Bishops to haue byn iniuriouſly ambitious, then the Citty Rebellious.* So he.

Full ſatiſfaction pag. 119.

47. This is his faithfull reply and full ſatisfaction, according to the title of his booke. And now conſider good Reader what honeſt men theſe two Miniſters are, that ſo contradict the one the other, and that vpon conference togeather for thy deceipt and coſenage: for euen now yow heard Doctour *Sutcliffe* to affirme that the Biſhop of *Geneua* had byn temporall

A coſening conferẽce betweene Sutcliffe & Mortõ.

Prince

Prince for many hundred yeares, and that vpon the preaching of *Farellus*, *Caluin* and others, they chaunged their Monarchy into a popular State, and that himſelf miſliked the ſame, according to the groundes of deuinity; and how then doth he ſay heere to his fellow Miniſter *Morton*, that the Biſhop of *Geneua* was neuer there Prince, and that the ſtate of the towne was a free State of it ſelf? Can theſe thinges ſtād togeather? *Morton* ſaith moreouer he could not finde *Sutcliffes* booke, which truly is a thing very ſtrāge, there being ſo many thouſandes printed of them in England; but more ſtrange it is, that Deane *Sutcliffe* ſhould ſo ſoone forget his owne booke, and what he wrote therin, & ſo egregiouſly coſin his Brother-Miniſter in their priuate conference, as to make him belieue, and vtter now in print *quid pro quo*, and chalke for cheeſe as he doth. But it cannot ſeeme probable that *Morton* belieued it himſelf, but rather would make the ſimple Reader belieue the ſame, and ſo dazell his eyes for his deceipt: & this is their manner of dealing in moſt matters, where fraude may be vſed.

The abſurd falſe dealing of tvvo Miniſters togeather.

48. It were ouer long to looke into all other examples obiected by the moderate anſwerer, how they ar replied vnto by T. M. As for example the known reuoltes and Rebellions of *Flanders*, and of thoſe States againſt their lawfull Princes, and ſo many outrages committed therin for almoſt now forty yeares, if not more; the bloudy tumultes in *Germany* and *Switzerland* vpon *Luther* and *Zuinglius* their doctrine, wherin *Zuinglius* himſelf the head ſtirrer was ſlaine; the like in *Denmark* for expelling Catholicke Religion, and bringing in of *Lutheraniſme*; the manifeſt Rebellion, intruſion, and oppreſsion of *Duke Charles* in *Sweueland* againſt his Nephew the King of *Polonia*, lawfull Inheritour of thoſe States, enduring vnto theſe daies; as alſo the open warres of *Boſcaine*, and his fellowes in *Hungary*

Sundry other Rebellions of Proteſtāts.

Hungary againſt the Emperour, in fauour of Proteſtant Religion, and of the Turke himſelf, whoſe Confederates they confeſſe themſelues to be.

49. Into theſe & other examples as I ſaid, time will not permit vs to enter with any length, nor will it be to any purpoſe; for that we ſhall finde them as ſleightely anſwered or ſhifted of, as the reſt before. For vnto the firſt and laſt, of *Flanders* and *Hungary*, the Miniſter anſwereth in effect nothing at all; and I meruaile not, if he anſwered this with ſilence, ſeing he anſwered all the tumultes of *Scotland* for ſo many yeares continued, by ſaying only as yow haue heard: *That Buchanans Chronicle was recalled by an act of Parlament.*

Seely anſvveres or rather ſhiftings of.

50. To the other of *Germany* and *Luthers* ſeditious proceedinges both in wordes, writinges and deedes, wherin it is obiected among many other thinges that he cenſured both K. *Henry* of *England*, and many other Princes with intolerable, inſolent, and vile ſpeaches, affirming them vnworthy of all gouerment; that Proteſtantes handes muſt be imbrued with bloud, & that thervpon enſued moſt bloudy warres throughout *Germany* and almoſt all Chriſtendome beſides, *Munſters* Rebellions alſo in the ſame countries, who preached, that Rebellion againſt Catholicke Princes for Religion was to be called *The warre of God*, and that he had ſpeciall commandement from God to that effect; whervpon enſued the ſlaughter of a hundred & thirty thouſand men in three monethes &c. To the firſt of *Luther*, he anſwereth very ſagely in theſe wordes: *Luthers literall cenſure of wordes will be partly confeſſed, but the other of ſwordes, which drew bloud can neuer be proued.*

Reply pa. 124.

Yow ſee vpon what pointes of deſperate deniall he ſtandeth, and yow may remember how cleerly the matter hath byn proued before, and what is extant in moſt writers of our time about the ſame.

51. The other of *Munſter* he reiecteth, as not being of his

his Religion, & yet no man can deny, but that he was of *Luthers* ſchoole, and ſpronge out of the firſt ſeed and ſpirit of that new Ghoſpell; but hard it is to diſcerne who be brethren, and who be not, when it ſtandeth for their commodity to acknowledge or deny one the other. Heere yow ſee he denieth *Munſter*, & acknowledgeth *Luther* to be of their Ghoſpell and fraternity; and yet no man doth reiect them more contemptuoſly, or condemneth them more ſeriouſly for Heretikes then *Luther* himſelfe, as before out of his owne wordes yow haue heard. To the ſtirres in *Switzerland* raiſed by *Zuinglius*, who was ſlaine alſo in the feild, he ſaith in like manner nothing; and little more to *Denmarke*, but that now all is quiet there, and Lutherane Religion in full poſſeſsion, but he telleth vs not by what ſtyrres and tumultes the ſame was brought in.

52. To that of *Sueueland*, and the open Rebellion of thoſe Kingdomes, he findeth only this ſhift to put of the matter. *It was* (ſaith he) *the demaund of the whole ſtate, for defence of their countrey priuiledges, liberties, and fruition of Religion; can any Papiſt call this Rebellion?* No truely Syr in your ſenſe, who doe call the ſtate whatſoeuer multitude of people doth rebell againſt their Princes, for the liberty of your Ghoſpel, for ſo yow called the party Proteſtant of *Scotland* (if yow remember) the Lordes of the *Congregation*, and the ſtate of the Realme: and the other party that ſtood with the Queene, was called a faction, and ſo likewiſe in *France* and *Flanders*, *Germany* and *Sueueland*, thoſe that tooke exceptions firſt, and then armes againſt their Princes, are called the *State, or States, vnited Prouinces, thoſe of the Religion*, and by other like titles of honour: and the other part or rather body it ſelfe, hath the name of *Enemies, Perſecutors, Tyrantes, Papiſtes*, and other odious appellations. But I would make this demaund, how came theſe particuler men to be *States*, & to be called *the Common-*

wealth? were they not firſt ſubiectes ? And did they not firſt withdraw themſelues from the obedience of their lawfull Princes, by ſleightes, diſsimulations, pretence of greiuances, liberty of Ghoſpell, and the like deuiſes, vntill at laſt they fell to open armes? May not any number of rebells make themſelues a ſtate in this ſenſe? But I will vrge yow no further, for that I well ſee yow cannot anſwere, & to driue yow beyond the wall is to ſmall purpoſe, I haue compaſsion of yow.

A BRIEF

A BRIEF CENSVRE IS GIVEN OF A NEVV TREATISE set forth by T.M. INTITVLED, A Confutation of the Popes Supremacy, as ſupreme head of Rebellion &c.

Annexed to his former iuſtification of Proteſtant-Princes, for matters of Rebellion.

CHAP. V.

THis Miniſter *Thomas Morton* not content, after the pretended confirmation of his firſt diſcouery and reaſons therof, to haue added a ſecond Treatiſe, conteyning (as he ſaith) *A Iuſtification of Proteſtantes* againſt imputations of diſobedience and Rebellion againſt temporall Princes, either in doctrine or practice

ctice (both which you haue heard now how ſubſtãtially he hath performed) he thought good alſo to ad a third Treatiſe (though nothing needfull to the argument in hand) which he intituleth, *A confutation of the principles of Romish doctrine in two pointes, first, concerning the Pope ſupreame head of Rebellion, and ſecondly, the impious conceipt of Equiuocation.* And foraſmuch as of the ſecond point, which is Equiuocation, we are to treat more largly in the enſuing Chapters, and that the firſt ſeemed to me impertinent to be treated againe ſeuerally in this place, the ſubſtance therof hauing byn touched ſufficiently, foraſmuch as belongeth to this affaire, in the former Chapters, eſpecially the ſecond; I had purpoſed once to paſſe it ouer without any anſwere at all, as indeed not deſeruing any, it being only a certaine diſorderly hudling togeather of peeces and parcelles of other mens collections about that matter, better handled by themſelues: But yet conſidering afterward the ſpeciall manner of this mans treating the ſame matters, both in regard of fraude and ſimplicity, though contrary the one to the other; I iudged it not amiſſe to giue the Reader ſome taſt therof in this one Chapter, wherby he may be able to frame a iudgment of the reſt, and of the exorbitant veine of this mans writing.

The title of T. M. his newe Treatiſe.

The cauſe of this ſeuerall Chapter.

Confut. Pag. 1.

2. Firſt then he beginneth the very firſt lines of his firſt Chapter with theſe wordes: *This pretended predominance (ſaith he) of the Pope in temporall cauſes, whether directly or indirectly conſidered (in which diuiſion of gouerning the Romish ſchoole is at this day extreamly deuided) if it be from God, it will ſure plead* Scriptum eſt &c. By which ſole entrance yow may take a ſcantling of the mãs diſcretion; for it cannot be denied I thinke (except we deny the Ghoſpell) but that *Scriptum eſt* was pleaded alſo by the diuell, and not only by God, as in like manner it hath byn by all Hereticks, the diuels cheif Chaplains, ſince

Tõ his firſt cauillation.

Math. 4.

ſince that time; and conſequently it was no good *exordium* to build all vpon this foundation.

3. Secondly it is not true, *that the Romish ſchole is ſo extreamly deuided* in this diuiſion of gouerning directly or indirectly, as the Miniſter would make it: for the queſtion is not at all of gouerning, but how the right to gouerne in temporall cauſes, was deliuered by Chriſt to *S. Peter* and his Succeſſours, whether directly, togeather with the ſpiritual gouernment ouer ſoules, or els indirectly and by a certaine conſequence, when the ſaid ſpirituall gouernment is letted and impugned, as before hath byn declared. In which difference of opinions there is no ſuch *extremity of diuiſion* among Catholickes, as this man would haue men thinke: for that all doe agree in the ſubſtance of the thing it ſelf, that the Pope hath this authority from God *Iure diuino*, in certaine caſes, whether directly or indirectly that little importeth to this our controuerſy with the Proteſtantes, who deny both the one and the other. And ſo much for that. To his ſecond cauillation.

4. The next ſentence or obiection after the former preface (which is the very firſt of his diſcourſe) is framed by him, but yet in our name, vnder the title of the Romane pretence in theſe wordes: *The high Prieſtes in the old Teſtament* (ſaith he) *were ſupreame in ciuill cauſes*, ergo *they ought to be ſo alſo in the new*: for which he citeth, one *Carerius*, a Lawier, that wrote of late in *Padua De poteſtate Romani Pontificis*, defending the former opinion of Canoniſtes for direct dominion, & citeth his wordes in Latin thus: *Dico Pontificem in veteri Teſtamento fuiſſe Rege maiorem*: And Engliſheth the ſame as before yow haue heard, that the high Prieſt was ſupreame, in ciuill cauſes; which wordes, of *ciuill cauſes*, he putteth in of his owne, and if yow marke them, doe marre the whole market: for that *Carerius* hath them not either in wordes or ſenſe, but teacheth the plaine cõtrary in all his Pag. 2. *Carerius li. 2. Rom. Pontif. ca. 18. & Sander. in viſib. monarch.*

all his discourse, to wit, that he meaneth in matters appertaining to Religion and Preisthood, and not of temporall principality, which this Author granteth to haue byn greater in the old Testament in dealing with Eccleſiasticall men & matters, then in the new; & to that effect is he cited presently after by the Minister himself, contrary to that which heere he feigneth him to say. But let vs heare the wordes of *Carerius*. *Tertiò dico* (saith he) *etiam in Testamento veteri fuisse Pontificem Rege maiorem: quod quidem probatur &c.* Thirdly I say that
„ the high Prieſt was greater also in the old Testament
„ then the King, which is proued first out of the 27.
„ Chapter of Numbers, where it is appointed by God,
„ that *Iosue* and all the people should be directed by the
„ word of the high Prieſt *Eleazar*, saying, whē any thing
„ is to be done, let *Eleazar* the high Prieſt consult with
The dignity of Prieſthood proued to be more then Regall. God, and at his word aswell *Iosue*, as all the children of Israell, and whole multitude shall goe forth and come in &c. And secondly the same is proued out of the fourth of *Leuiticus*, where foure kind of Sacrifices being ordained, according to the dignity of the per-
„ sons, the first two are of a calfe for the high Prieſt &
„ commonwealth, the third and fourth of a hee and
„ shee-goat for the Prince and priuate persons: Wherby *Carerius* inferreth a most certaine dignity and preheminence of the Prieſtes state, aboue the temporall Prince, though he say not *in ciuill causes*, as this Minister doth bely him.

5. And wheras *Carerius* had said in two former Answeres, first that in the old Testament, Eccleſiasticall and secular iurisdiction were not so distinct, but that both might be in some cases in the King, and secondly that in the new law, the spirituall power was more eminent then in the old; he commeth thirdly to say that in the old law the High Prieſt in some respectes was greater also then the King, which cannot be vn-
False dealing against Carerius.

derstood

derstood *of ciuill power*, except the Author will be contrary to himself. And therfore that clause was very falsly and perfidiously thrust in by the Minister, and this with so much the lesse shame, for that in the end of the same Chapter he citeth the same Author to the plaine contrary sense, saying: *In veteri lege Regnum erat substantiuum & sacerdotium adiectiuum &c.* That in the old law the Kingdome was the substantiue, that stood of it self, and Preisthood was the adiectiue, that leaned theron, but contrary-wise in the new law, Preisthood and spirituall iurisdiction is the substantiue or principall in gouernment, and temporall principality is the adiectiue depending therof, for direction, and assistance, the one both by nature and Godes law being subordinate to the other, to wit the temporall to the spirituall. And thus much concerning this guile by flat falshood. Now to a tricke or two of other sortes of shifting by him vsed for deluding the Reader.

Confut. p. 2. Carer. l. 2 c. 1.

6. It followeth in the same place, as a second *Romish pretence: That the old Testament was a figure of the new in Christ, and therfore that in the new, the spirituall power* (as the Popedome, saith he) *must be the chiefe or substantiue &c.* Which short sentence he patcheth out of two different Authors, *Salmeron* and *Carerius*, part of one, & part of another, and then frameth this graue answere thervnto: *In this obiection* (saith he) *there is more childhood then manhood, babish grammer, then sound deuinity.* So he. And will you heare his manhood in sound deuinity? It followeth imediatly. *The old Testament indeed* (saith he) *in his earthly elementes was a figure of this spirituall and heauenly; but of the truly heauenly, the day of that eternall sabboth, and the Celestiall Hierusalem, the Mother-Citty of the Sainctes of God.* Behold his manhood in sound deuinity. Let it be so, that the old Testament was in many thinges a figure of the heauenly sabboth and Celestial Hierusalem, but what (Syr) will yow conclude of this

Salmeron Disp. 12. in Epistolas Paul. Carer. l. 2. c. 1.

Hebr. 4.

Hovv the old Testament vvas a figure of the nevv.

this by your ſound deuinity? Was it not a figure alſo of many thinges vpon earth, which ſhould be fulfilled in the new Teſtament? Were not their Cerimonies and Sacrifices a figure of our Sacramentes & Sacrifice? their *Manna* of our Euchariſt? their circumciſions and waſhinges, figures of our Baptiſme? doth
1.Cor.9. not *S.Paul* in the ninth and tenth of his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* ſet down many examples to this effect?
Deut.25. As that of *Deuteronomy*: *Nō alligabu os boui trituranti*, thou ſhalt not binde vp the month of the oxe that laboureth, vnto our preachers of the new Teſtament? as alſo the paſsing of the Red-ſea by the Iſraelites? their being baptized in the cloude? their food of the *Manna*? their drinking out of the rock, which prefigured Chriſt? and diuers other thinges, wherof he ſaith: *Hæc autem in figura facta ſunt noſtri*; theſe thinges were done
1.Cor.10. in figure of our preſent State. And againe: *Hæc autem omnia in figura contingebant illis*; all theſe thinges did happen to the Iewes in figure, but were to be fulfilled truly and really according to the ſpirituall meaning in the new Teſtament? Is not all this ſo? were not theſe thinges to be fulfilled aſwell vpon earth as in heauen? how thē doth our Miniſter put that aduerſitiue clauſe: *but of the truly heauenly*; as though the old Teſtament in her earthly Elementes had prefigured nothing to be fulfilled but only in heauen. Is this ſound deuinity? Is this manhood? Nay is it not rather *babish childhood*, that ſeemeth not to know the very firſt Elementes of true deuinity?

7. I let paſſe the ſhameleſſe corruption which he vſeth in tranſlating the very wordes cited by him out of *Salmeron*, for proofe of his obiection, made in our behalfe, and I call it ſhameleſſe for that euery child which vnderſtandeth Latin, may ſee the Miniſters ſhift therin. The Authors words are theſe as this man
Conf. p.3. heere recounteth them: *Et hoc Regnum terrenum vmbra tamen*

tamen fuit ſpiritualis regiminis in Eccleſia Chriſtiana: and yet this earthly Kingdome (of the Iewes) was a ſhaddow of the ſpirituall gouernment, that was to be in the Chriſtian Church: meaning therby that the moſt excellent ſpirituall power and gouernment ouer ſoules, which Chriſt was to inſtitute in his Church, at his comming in fleſh, to wit, the power of abſoluing from ſinnes vpon earth, the aſsiſtance giuen by the Sacramentes, and the like, were ſhaddowed in a certaine manner by the earthly Kingdome among the Iewes: And how doth T. M. now tranſlate theſe wordes, & frame our obiection out of them: *The old Teſtament* (ſaith he) *was a figure of the new in Chriſt, therfore in the new the Popedome is the ſubſtātiue &c.* Heere are two ſhort propoſitions you ſee, the antecedent and conſequent, & both framed with falſhood; for that the antecedent ſet downe out of *Salmeron*, is not that which he affirmeth in his Latin words, as already we haue ſhewed, though otherwiſe in it ſelf the propoſitiō be true; nor (will I thinke) T. M. can deny, but that the old Teſtament was a figure of the new in Chriſt. There followeth then the conſequent which is no leſſe corruptly inferred in our name, then was the antecedent affirmed, for that we doe not inferre, nor yet the Author *Carerius* in the ſaid ſecond propoſition or conſequence by him alledged, that for ſomuch as the old Teſtament is a figure of the new, therfore in the new the Popes ſpirituall authority is the ſubſtantiue &c. for that this were a weake inference, as euery man ſeeth; nay *Carerius* maketh no inference at all in the place by him alledged, but only vſeth that ſimilitude, which before yow haue heard of the ſubſtantiue and adiectiue: ſo as this inference is only a fiction of the Miniſter to make himſelf and other men merry, and to giue occaſion to play vpon his Aduerſary, with the reproach of *childhood and babish grammer*, as now he hath

Cauillatiō of T. M.

done. But indeed the true consequence that may be made vpon the Catholicke Authors wordes, which hitherto he hath alledged, is only this; that forasmuch as the Kingdome and gouernment among the Iewes euen in Ecclesiasticall thinges was but earthly, and a figure or shaddow in respect of that which was to be ouer soules in the Christian Church, it followeth that this in respect of spirituality, was to be much more eminent then the other, as the thing figured, then the figure or shaddow it self. And what inconuenience hath this doctrine that it should be called *childhood and babish grammer.*

8. But now shall yow heare a new strange deuise of his, neuer heard of (I thinke) in the world before, & such a *manhood in sound deuinity*, that sheweth him scarce to be arriued to *childhood* in true Theology; for that to exalt temporall principality of a Kingdome and depresse Priesthood, he seeketh to abase the High Priesthood of Christ himself; for so he vaunteth that he will returne the foresaid argument vpon the Romish.

Conf. par. 3. pag. 3. Christ (saith he) being King and Priest, was shaddowed by the types of the old Testament; but in Christ his Kingdome had the preheminence of Priesthood, bycause he is a Priest only for vs, but he is King ouer vs. Secondly as Priest he is suppliant to the Father; as King he is predominant ouer all powers and principalities equally with the Father, *Ergo*, this order inherent in Christ ought to hold as conuenient among Christians. An argument demonstratiue. So he.

9. Wherby yow may see, first how good a Logitian he is, who auoucheth this for an argument demonstratiue, which is indeed a very Elench & Sophisme, and manifest fallacy, for that he changeth his subiect from sense to sense, making one proposition of his argument in the one, and the other in another sense. For when he talketh of Christes Priesthood compa-

A Sophisticall fallacy in steed of a demonstratiue argument.

ring

ring it with his being a King, he meant (and ſo he ought to doe) as he was man, and inferiour to his Father; and when he ſpeaketh of the other, of his being a King, he vnderſtandeth it, as he was God and equall to his Father; and ſo taking the one in one meaning, and the other in the other, his principall meaning is to deceaue his Reader with a ſophiſticall argument inſtead of a demonſtratiue; & yet doth the good man ſo confide in his logicall ſcience, as in one place he triumpheth ouer his Aduerſary, that did but once name Logicke in theſe wordes: *Dare yow* (ſaith he) *appeale to Logicke? this is the art of all artes, and the high tribunall of reaſon and truth it ſelf; which no man in any matter, whether it be caſe of humanity or deuinity, can iuſtly refuſe*: which is ſo ridiculous a ſimplicity, as no man can read without laughter. For what high tribunall (I pray yow) hath logicke in deuinity? Or who gaue her this tribunall? was there no deuinity before Logicke was inuented by the Philoſophers? Logicke is not a ſcience, according to *Ariſtotle*, but only *modus ſciendi*, a manner or meane how to come to ſcience, and it miniſtreth not matter, but forme of argument, as armour to the Logitian, wherby to impugne falſhood and ignorance in euery ſcience, euen as the Cutlers ſhop doth yeeld weapons to ſouldiers that goe to warre, and yet cannot the Cutlers ſhop be iuſtly called the high tribunal of all matters belonging to Chieualry and feates of warfare, and conſequently this was a vaine floriſh & oſtentation.

Reply par. 3. pag. 54.

10. But now to returne to the principall point, we haue ſeene that this argument is ſo far from being demonſtratiue, as it is no argument at all, in regard of the Equiuocation and fallacy therin conteyned. Let vs then conſider the ſame in reſpect of the matter & ſubſtance it ſelf. Firſt I ſay that it conteyneth a manifeſt, fond and impious paradox, that Chriſtes King-

VVhether Chriſtes Prieſthood or Kingly povver vvere greater vpon earth.

dome (as he was both King and Prieſt) had the preheminence of his Prieſthood; and I call it a *paradox*, for that I thinke no Chriſtian man of learning euer held it before, and much leſſe any ſound deuine. Secondly I call it *fond*, in reſpect of his ridiculous reaſons alledged for the ſame, which preſently we ſhall examine: And thirdly I call it *impious*, for that it is both againſt the Scriptures, and preiudiciall to Chriſtes higheſt dignity of Prieſthood vpon earth: Wherby alſo followeth that this Miniſters inference or concluſion (*Ergo this order inherent in Chriſt ought to be held as conuenient among Chriſtians*) muſt be cenſured by the ſame cenſures, for that it concludeth a generall preheminence and excellency of Kingly State, before Prieſthood, which is the quite oppoſite aſſertion to that which all ancient Fathers, and namely *S. Chryſoſtome* out of all their common ſenſe, doth maintaine in his bookes *De Sacerdotio*, affirming, that the office and dignity of a Prieſt, doth ſo far exceed that of a King, as gold doth ſiluer, heauen earth, and the ſoule the body: *Regno Sacerdotium* (ſaith he) *tanto eſt excellentius, quantum carnis & Spiritus interuallum eſſe poteſt*; Prieſthood is ſomuch more excellent then Kingly authority, as there can be difference imagined betweene fleſh and ſpirit. And in another place the ſame Father: *Sacerdotium eſt principatus ipſo etiam Regno venerabilior & maior*: Prieſthood is a Princedome more venerable & great then is Kingly authority. And then againe: *Ne mihi narras purpuram &c.* doe not tell me of purple or diademe, of ſcepter or golden apparell of Kinges, for theſe are but ſhaddowes, and more vaine then May-flowers: *Si vis videre diſcrimen quantum abſit Rex a Sacerdote, expende modum poteſtatis vtrique traditæ &c.* If yow will ſee indeed the true difference betweene them, and how much the King is inferiour to a Prieſt, conſider the meaſure of power geuen to them both, & yow ſhall ſee the Prieſtes tribu-

Chriſoſt. l. 3. de Sacerdotio ſub initio.

Chryſ. ho. 5. de verb. Iſaiæ.

Ibid.

nall

nall much higher then that of the King. So he. Wherunto agreeth that of *S. Gregory Nazienzen* ſpoken to the Emperour himſelf: *The law of Christ* (ſaith he) *hath made yow ſubiect to my power, and to my tribunall, for wee* (Biſhops) *haue an Empire alſo, and that more excellent and perfect then yours, except yow will ſay the ſpirit is inferiour to the flesh, and heauenly thinges to earthly.* *Naz. orat. ad ciues timore perculſos.*

11. So he. And much more to this effect, which yow may read cited out of diuers Fathers, in a booke ſet forth this laſt yeare, in anſwere to *Syr Edward Cookes* Reportes by a Catholicke deuine, who handleth this point more largely and particularly in the ſecond and fourth Chapters of the ſaid anſwere. And this is ſufficient to ſhew the inference or concluſion of T. M. to be falſe, touching the power and dignity of Prieſthood, and of Kingly principallity among men. Now let vs returne to the conſideration therof in Chriſt himſelf, which is the principall queſtion, though in effect it be decided by that which now wee haue ſhewed, for that the dignity and preheminence aboue Kingly dignity, of Prieſthood in man, which the foreſaid Fathers doe ſo reſolutly affirme, inferreth alſo the preheminence of Prieſthood in Chriſt, for ſomuch as from that deſcendeth this other; but yet I thinke it not amiſſe to handle the ſame ſomewhat more diſtinctly, the Miniſters paradox therin being ſo prophane and irreligious as hath byn ſaid.

12. Firſt then as Chriſt is acknowledged both by them and vs to haue byn both Prieſt and King, according as he was prefigured in *Melchiſedech*, who had both theſe dignities in himſelf, ſo the one and the other excellency of Prieſtly and Kingly preheminence, were in him according as he was man, and vnder his Father, which for ſo much as appertained to his Prieſthood is graunted heere by T. M. and the matter is euident in it ſelf; for that Chriſt as God could not of-

fer Sacrifice, nor make interceſsion to his Father for vs (which are the chief offices of Prieſthood) for that this belõgeth to an inferiour, according to that ſaying of *S. Ambroſe*: *Sacerdos idem & hoſtia Sacerdotium, tamen humana conditionis officium eſt*: Chriſt was both Prieſt and Sacrifice, yet was his Prieſthood the office of humane condition. *S. Auguſtine* alſo talking of both dignities ſaith: *Secundum hominem Chriſtus, & Rex & Sacerdos effectus eſt*: Chriſt was made both King and Prieſt according as he was man. And the ſame is plaine by Scripture, in which euery where is acknowledged that Chriſtes Kingdome was giuen him by his Father: *Ego autem conſtitutus Rex ab eo ſuper Sion montem Sanctum eius*, ſaith Chriſt in the Pſalmes: I am apointed King by him vpon his holy hill of *Sion, ergo* he was King by gift and appointement of his Father. And in the ſame Pſalme God the Father ſaith vnto him: *Poſtula à me & dabo tibi gentes hæreditatem tuam & poſſeſsionem tuam terminos terræ*: Aske of me, and I will giue vnto thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the confines of all the earth for thy poſſeſsion: ſo as in this Kingdome, God the Father required an acknowledgment. And yet further the Prophet ſpeaking to the ſaid Father of this Kingdome of Chriſt in fleſh ſaid: *Conſtituiſti eum ſuper opera manuum tuarum, & omnia ſubieciſti ſub pedibus eius*: thou haſt appointed him for Lord and King ouer the workes of thy handes, that is to ſay, ouer all thy creatures, and thou haſt ſubiected all thinges vnder his feet: which point *S. Paul* doth proſecute moſt excellently in the firſt two Chapters of his Epiſtle to the Hebrewes; and there can be no doubt in this matter, for Chriſt himſelf ſpeaketh moſt plainly: *Data eſt mihi omnis poteſtas in cælo & in terra*: All power is giuen vnto me both in heauen and earth, ſo as he acknowledgeth it to be giuen, which cannot ſtand with his diuinity, in that he is God, and equall with his Father: in which

Ambr. l. 3. de fid. c. 5.

Aug. l. 1. de conſenſu Euang. cap. 3.

Pſal. 2.

Ibid. & Hebr. 1.

Pſal. 8.

Math. 28.

regard

regard all was his owne without gift, according to thoſe wordes of *S. Paul* to the *Philippians*: *Non rapinam arbitratus eſt eſſe ſe aqualem Deo*; He did not thinke it vſurpation to be equall to God his Father according to his diuinity. Wherfore it muſt needs appeare great ignorance in our Miniſter, to aſsigne him this his temporall Kingdome as he was God and equall to his Father. Phil. 2.

13. But now to the principall propoſition *VVhether Chriſt his Kingdome had the preheminence of his Prieſthood, or his Prieſthood of his Kingdome*; though in part the matter be made cleere by that which is already ſpokē; yet ſhal we adde two or three wordes more. And firſt the matter is manifeſt by the narration it ſelf in Scripture, when the figure of his Prieſthood and Kingdome is declared in *Geneſis*, in the perſon of *Melchiſedech*: for thus ſaith the text: *Melchiſedech* King of *Salem* bringing forth bread and wine (for he was the Prieſt of God moſt high) gaue his benediction to *Abraham*, and tooke tithes of him for all that he had. In which example is greatly to be noted the reflection it ſelf and emphaſis which the Scripture maketh vpon his Prieſtoood: *Erat enim ſacerdos Dei altiſſimi*: For he was the Prieſt of the moſt high God, as who ſhould ſay, that otherwiſe he could neuer haue offred vp in ſacrifice that bread and wine (the higheſt action of all other vpon earth) as King, except he had byn Prieſt: nor yet haue bleſſed *Abraham*, and much leſſe haue taken tithes of him: Which point *S. Paul* doth ponder very deeply and ſeriouſly in his Epiſtle to the *Hebrewes*, repeating often times for the greater glory of Chriſt and his powerfull Prieſthood this example of *Melchiſedech*: *Aßimilatus filio Dei* (ſaith he) *manet ſacerdos in perpetuum*; *intuemini autem quantus ſit hic, cui & decimas dedit de præcipuis Abraham Patriarcha*: This *Melchiſedech* bearing a likenes of the Sonne of God, remained a Prieſt perpetually: *Neq;* Gen. 14. Hebr. 7.

initium

initium dierum neque finem vitæ habens: hauing neither beginning of his dayes, nor end of his life: consider then how great a man this was, to whome the Patriarch gaue tithes of all the principall thinges he had.

14. This is *S. Paules* contemplation of the matter, who in his said Epistle to the *Hebrewes*, laying this foundation of the figure of *Melchisedech* for the Priesthood and Kingdome of Christ (though more specially as yow see for his Priesthood) doth presently after the consideration of those wordes, *Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te*, thou art my Sonne, I haue this day begotten thee (wherby he proueth Christ to haue byn not the adopted but natural Sonne of God) after this, I say, he doth insist, for demonstration of his highest office and dignity, vpon those wordes of God the Father for his Priesthood: *Tu es sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech:* Thou art a Priest foreuer according to the order of *Melchisedech*; out of which wordes *of highest dignity and commission, S. Paul* doth make many inferences, as that in the second Chapter: *Nusquam Angelos apprehendit, sed semen Abrahæ &c. vt misericors fieret & fidelis Pontifex ad Deum.* God tooke not Angelles but the seed of Abraham to frame Christ, to the end he might be both a mercifull and faithfull High Priest for vs with God, for propitiation of our sinnes. And againe in the third Chapter: *Behold yow Holy brethren who are partakers of this our heauenly vocation, Consider our Apostle and High Priest of this our confession Iesus.* And in the fourth Chapter hauing spoken much of the Sabboth day, that he is to giue vs in the next life, he adioineth this exhortation: *Habentes ergo Pontificem magnum &c. we hauing therfore a great high Priest that hath pearced the heauens, Iesus the Sonne of God, let vs hold fast our confession, for we haue not a Priest that cannot take compassion of our infirmities &c.* And againe in the fifth Chapter hauing said first: *Omnis Pontifex &c.* Euery High Priest chosen

Psal. 109.

Hebr. 2.

Hebr. 3.

Hebr. 4. The dignity of Priesthood in Christ aboue his Kingly authority.

choſen out of men, is appointed for men in thoſe thinges that appertaine vnto God, that he offer giftes and Sacrifices for ſin &c. after this (I ſay) *S. Paul* doth immediatly inferre this concluſion about the ſupreame honor & dignity of Chriſt his Prieſthood: *Nec quiſquam ſumit ſibi honorem &c.* Neither may any man take the honour of Prieſthood vnto him, but he that is called by God, as *Aaron* was, and ſo Chriſt (though he were the true Sonne of God) did not aduance himſelf to this honour of being high Prieſt, but that he who ſaid vnto him *filius meus es tu*, thou art my Sonne, ſaid vnto him alſo *tu es ſacerdos in æternum*, thou art a Prieſt for euer, *appellatus à Deo Pontifex*, being called by God to be high Prieſt, according to the order of *Melchiſedech*, of whome there remaineth to vs a great ſpeech to vtter, and ſuch a one as needeth expoſition, wherof yow as yet for your weaknes ar not capable. So *S. Paul.*

15. And then in the other two ſequent Chapters to wit the ſeauenth and eight, he doth proſecute the ſame argument of the high dignity of Chriſtes Prieſthood much more largely. Among the Iewes (ſaith he) „ there were many Prieſtes made, for that they were „ letted by death to remaine, but this our high Prieſt re- „ maineth for euer: his Prieſthood is eternall, wherof it „ enſueth that he can for euer ſaue vs, interpoſing him- „ ſelf with God for vs by himſelf, and euer lyuing to „ make interceſsion for vs, for ſuch a high Prieſt was it „ conuenient that we ſhould haue, holy, innocent, vn- „ ſpotted, ſeperated from ſinners, and more excellent „ then the heauens themſelues. And againe in the next „ Chapter: Such a high Prieſt we haue, as ſitteth on the „ right hand of the ſeat of maieſty in heauen, and there „ he is Miniſter of the Saintes and true Tabernacle. „ Hebr. 7.

16. All this & much more hath *S. Paul* in that Epiſtle of the eminency of Chriſtes Prieſthood, therby to ſet forth the moſt admirable excellency of his power

and glory therby giuen him from his Father for our saluation; but of the glory of his temporal Kingdome in this life, he saith little or nothing. And had not then the foresaid Fathers and holy Bishops *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Gregory Nazienzen*, *S. Ambrose* and others, great cause by contemplation of this supereminent worthines of Christes Priesthood, to inferre the great preheminēce in generall of the Christian Priesthood, before Kingly dignity of earthly principality? But let vs yet consider one reason more.

The auncient Fathers inferēce about Priesthood.

17. The office of high Priesthood, as partly hath appeared by that we haue said, and is euident by the discourse of *S. Paul*, appointing him for a meanes or mediator betweene God and man, consisteth principally in two thinges or partes: first in respect of that which he is to performe towardes God, as to his Superiour: secondly in the functions that he is to vse towardes the people, as inferiours and subiectes. The first consisteth in offering sacrifice, oblations, prayers and intercession for the sinnes of the people, as already touching Christ our Sauiour out of the Apostle we haue declared. The second consisteth in the spirituall power, dignity, authority and functions therof, which our said high Priest Christ Iesus, as head & high Priest of his Church, purchased with the sacrifice of his owne bloud, hath, and may exercise vpon the said Church for euer, for vnto him as our high Priest it appertaineth not only to make intercession for his said Church, but to gouerne the same also, and to direct it by conuenient meanes vnto the end of their saluation, which he hath designed, and for this to make lawes, prescribe orders, appoint Sacramentes, ordaine spirituall tribunals of iudgment, giue sentence of separation of the good from the bad, forgiue and retaine sinnes, which spirituall gouernment of soules belonging to the office of high Priesthood, is a different thing

Tvvo principall partes of Priesthood.

Christ a spirituall King by his Priesthood but not a temporall.

thing from the ciuill gouernment of temporall principality, and yet is a Kingdome alſo in it ſelf, but a ſpirituall Kingdome ouer ſoules and not ouer bodies. And this had Chriſt our Sauiour togeather with his high Prieſthood, according to the prediction and viſion of *Daniel*: *Aſpiciebam & ecce quaſi filius hominis &c.* I did looke and behold there appeared as it were the Sonne of man, and God gaue vnto him power and honour, and a Kingdome, his power is an eternall power, and his Kingdome ſhall neuer be corrupted. And ſo in the ſecond Pſalme, after he had ſaid, *I am made King by him vpon his holy Hill of Sion*, he addeth preſently to ſhew that it was a ſpirituall Kingdome: *Prædicans præceptum eius*, my office is to preach his commandement, and many other authorities may be alledged to proue that Chriſt in that he was high Prieſt had ſupreame ſpirituall Kingly authority in like manner for gouerning of ſoules. Dan. 7.

18. But now for the temporall Kingdome of Chriſt in this life, to wit, whether beſides this ſpirituall and Royall gouernment of our ſoules, he had Kingly Dominion alſo vpon our bodies and goodes, and vpon all the Kingdomes of the earth, ſo as he might iuſtly haue excerciſed all actions of that temporall iuriſdiction, as caſting into priſon, appointing new officers, Kings and Monarches; yea whether their power, and authority, and intereſt to their States did ceaſe when he came, as the right of Prieſtly authority did: in this (I ſay) and other pointes depending herof, there are two diſputable opinions betweene Catholicke Deuines; the one holding the affirmatiue, that Chriſt was Lord & King temporall, as heere is ſet downe, which * diuers learned men both of old and our time doe defend; the other affirming that albeit Chriſt togeather with his high Kingly dignity of ſpirituall power, was Lord alſo cõſequently ouer our bodies, & ſhall raigne

Of Chriſtes temporall Kingdome.

* *D. Tho. l. 1. de reg. Prin. c. 11. D. Anton. 3. par. ti. 3. cap. 2. Almain. l. de poteſt. Eccl. c. 8. Turrecr. l. 2. ſum. c. 116. Nau. in c. Nou. de iudic.*

ouer the ſame moſt glorioufly for all eternity in the life to come; yet that he renounced the vſe of all that Dominion in this life, and that in this ſenſe, he fled when they would haue made him King, and refuſed to deuide the inheritance betweene the two Brethrē when he was demaunded; and finally ſaid to *Pilate*, *My Kingdome is not of this world*, confeſsing himſelf to be a true temporal King alſo, according to *Pilates* meaning; but yet that the vſe and exerciſe therof was not for this world, but only for the next, wherof alſo the good thiefe vnderſtood when he ſaid on the Croſſe: *Be mindfull of me when thou shalt come into thy Kingdome.* And finally they alledge for proofe of this the wordes of *Zachary* the Prophet: *Ecce Rex tuus venit tibi iuſtus & Saluator & ipſe pauper*: Behold (*Sion*) thy King commeth vnto thee as a iuſt and ſauing King, but he is poore; as though he had ſaid, he is thy true King, but hath renounced the vſe and priuiledge of the ſame, and choſen pouerty in this world. And with this ſecond opinion which is the more * generall, doe concurre alſo the Proteſtantes of our age, that Chriſt tooke vpon him no temporall Kingly power in this life, leaſt if they held the contrary, it ſhould be inferred therof, that he left the ſame authority both of temporall and ſpirituall vnto *S. Peter* his Succeſſour; which yet the Catholickes that hold this opinion, explicate otherwiſe, ſaying: that albeit Chriſt had no direct Dominion in this life vpon temporall thinges, yet indirectly for preſeruation of his ſpirituall Dominion he had, and might haue vſed the ſame, and in that ſenſe hē left it to his ſaid Succeſſor.

Luc.12.

Io.18.

Luc.23.

Zach.9.

* *Ita tenet Abulenſis.q. 30. in Math.21. Valenſ. l.2. de doctrina. ca. 76.& 77. Victoria relect.1. de poteſt. Eccl.q.5. Sotus l.4. de iuſtitia q.4.art.1. Armacan. l.4.contr. Arme.c.12 Burgenſis in Scrutinio Scripturarum p.1.diſt.7.*

19. Of all which is inferred firſt the preheminence of high Prieſthood in Chriſt before his temporall Kingly principality, for that as we haue ſaid, the actions and functions of Chriſtes Prieſthood, haue not only more high & eminent dignity, both in that they

treat

treat with men for gouerning their ſoules, then Chriſtes temporall Kingdome for gouerning of bodies; but moreouer that the dignity of Prieſthood in Chriſt, conteineth in it ſelf a much more high ſpirituall Kingly power, then is the temporall.

20. Secondly is inferred, that the reaſons heere alledged by T. M. for his paradox, in preferring Chriſts being a King, before his Prieſthood, are vaine & fooliſh. The firſt wherof is this. *Chriſtes Kingdome* (ſaith he) *had the preheminence of Prieſthood, becauſe he is Priest only for vs, but he is King ouer vs.* But I would aske him, Is not Chriſt Prieſt *ouer vs* aſwel as *for vs?* hath he not a ſpirituall and Prieſtly iuriſdiction ouer our ſoules? doth not he binde and looſe our ſinnes? doth not he preſcribe vs Sacramentes? appoint vs lawes of liuing, and the like? or doe not theſe actions appertaine vnto him as high Prieſt ouer his Church? And againe I would aske him, about the ſecond member, as Chriſt in fleſh was King, was he not made King aſwell *for vs*, that is for our good, as *ouer vs*? doth not this man know that the difference betweene a good and bad gouernment, a true King and a Tyrant, conſiſteth in this, that the one raigneth for his owne good, the other for the good of his ſubiects? What impiety were it to affirme this defect to be in Chriſtes Kingly gouernment, and conſequētly what folly is it to bring in ſuch reaſons? But let vs ſee what he ſaith further.

Inferēces vpon the premiſes about the preheminence of Prieſthood aboue temporall Kingly authority.

21. *Chriſt* (ſaith he) *as Prieſt is ſuppliant to his Father, & as King he is predominant ouer all powers and principalities, equally with his Father*: But now wee haue ſhewed before that there be two partes or functions of Prieſthood, the one towardes God, to be ſuppliant by ſacrifice and interceſsion, the other to be predominant ouer men by ſpirituall gouernment vpon their ſoules, and that both theſe doe agree to Chriſt, in reſpect of his high Prieſthood, and as he is man, and much more

Page 3.

The folly of T. M. his diſcourſe.

the other of his temporall Kingdome: ſo as to make him equall to his Father in this, as T. M. doth, is an impious abſurdity; for that vnder his Fathers vniuerſall Kingdome Chriſt himſelf is alſo conteined as a ſubiect, according to thoſe wordes of graduation in
1. Cor. 3. *S. Paul: Omnia veſtra ſunt &c. vos autem Chriſti, Chriſtus autem Dei.* All thinges are yours, life, death, the world, thinges paſt, thinges to come, and yow are of Chriſt & Chriſt of God; that is to ſay, all thinges for Chriſt are ſubiect to yow, ſo you are and ought to be ſubiect to Chriſt, and Chriſt to God his Father. Now then ſee how wiſely this man frameth his foreſaid maine Concluſion, that as in Chirſt, his Kingdome had the preheminence of his Prieſthood (which is falſe as we haue ſhewed) ſo muſt it hold alſo among men, that Kingly power be preferred before Prieſtly, temporall before ſpirituall. Of which opinion *S. Chryſoſtome* doth thinke that no man, but mad or furious, can be.
Chryſ. l. 3. de Sacerdotio. *Equidem* (ſaith he) *neminem exiſtere talem dixerim, niſi ſi quis furiarum æſtu percitus ſit:* I cannot thinke any man to be of this opinion (to preferre temporall authority before ſpirituall) except a man ſhould become mad with the rage of furies. And ſo to *S. Chryſoſtome* I leaue our Miniſter to be charmed from theſe kinde of Hereticall furies.

THE

THE SECOND PART OF THIS CHAPTER, CONTEYNING

Three particular kindes of proofes, alledged by T.M. againſt the Popes Supremacy, to vvit:

Of the new, and old Teſtament, and from reaſon it ſelf.

ALl this that hitherto hath byn treated by our Aduerſary, hath byn by way, as it were, of preamble or preface, for abaſing Prieſthood, as you haue ſeene, euen in Chriſt himſelf, therby to ſubiect the ſame in Chriſtians to temporall authority; but about this point, I wiſh the Reader to looke ouer the forenamed two Chapters of the late Anſwere to *Syr Edward Cooke* (I meane the ſecond and fourth) and I ſuppoſe he will remaine ſatisfied in the preheminency of the one aboue the other. Now notwithſtanding for the ſecond part of this Chapter we ſhall bring into a ſhort view the principall pointes hãdled by T.M. in this

in this his confutation of the Popes Supremacy. And albeit you may eaſily make a coniecture of what ſubſtance it is like to be, by that which already you haue ſeene diſcuſſed; yet ſhall we deſcend to ſome principall particulars, for that he reduceth in effect all his proofes to three chief heades: the firſt concerning the ſtate of the Sinagogue vnder the Iewes, the ſecond of the Chriſtian Church vnder the new Teſtament, the third by reaſon common to them both.

From the State of the old Teſtament. §. 1.

23. FOr the firſt he ſetteth downe as argumentes of ours, for licencing Popes to kill Princes, a large liſt of Kinges and Princes depoſed, murthered, or moleſted vnder the old Teſtament, as though we did found our doctrine theron; for which cauſe he giueth the title of *Romish pretence* to the ſaid liſt, alledging therin fourteene ſeuerall examples; as *Saul* depoſed by the Prophet *Samuel*: *Roboam* by the Prophet *Achia*; the Queene *Athalia* by the chief Prieſt *Iehoida*; King *Antiochus* reſiſted and driuen out of his Dominion ouer *Iury* by the Prieſt *Mathathias* and the *Machabees* his children: the Prieſtes of *Baal*, and other Miniſters of the King ſlaine by the Prophets *Elias* & *Elizeus*: the great Captaine *Holofernes* by *Iudith*: King *Eglon* by *Ahod*: *Siſera* by *Iabel*: Queene *Iezabel* by *Iehu* at the appointmēt of the Prophet *Elizeus*, with ſeauenty children of King *Achab*: the death of King *Achab* who was ſlaine alſo miſerably himſelf by Godes appointment, & the Prophetes prediction: King *Amon* ſlaine by his owne ſeruantes

A liſt of Kings and Princes depoſed or ſlaine, impertinently brought in by T. M.

4. Reg. 19.

uantes for his wickednes; to whome we may ad the death of King *Agag* by the commaundement of *Samuel* the Prophet; the ſlaughter of King *Ioas* by his owne ſeruantes: And laſtly King *Ozias* for exerciſing the Prieſtes office and function, was by the high Prieſt depriued of his Kingdome. 1.Reg. 15. 4.Reg. 12.

24. And when he had ſet downe all this ranke of theſe vnfortunate Princes their deathes and depoſitions, as though we had delighted therin or propoſed all that heere is ſaid to be imitated, he ſaith: *Heere we heare nothing but fighting, diſpoſſeſſing, and killing of Kinges, & thoſe cheifly by Prieſtes and Prophetes of God in the old Teſtament propounded to the Prelates of the new, to teach them to erect their Miters aboue Crownes.* Doe yow ſee the malice of the man? If himſelf hath gathered togeather this Catalogue of Princes that came to ill endes, & were ſlaine or depoſed, is it maruaile though he heare nothing but that himſelf liketh to lay forth? Conf. p.4. 5.

25. The difference and compariſon of Miters and Crownes is fond and ridiculous, and brought in only to make the matter it ſelf odious; for the true compariſon is only betweene ſpirituall and temporal authority, the one apperteyning to ſoules, the other to bodies, the one called heauenly, the other earthly, the one proper to Prieſtes, the other to ciuill Princes as before yow haue heard declared out of ancient Fathers, who notwithſtanding were neuer reprehended nor called into enuy for erecting Miters aboue Crownes in that ſenſe, as this prophane Calumniator doth heere vrge and exaggerate: Hovv miters are aboue Crovvnes.

26. And as for this whole matter of the examples out of the old Teſtamẽt, our principall queſtion being only as before we haue declared: *VVhether God hath left any lawfull meanes for reſtrayning euill Princes; in certaine caſes of extreame danger, and whether Prieſtes alſo and Prelates in Chriſtian Religion, but eſpecially the higheſt Prieſt, may deale therin:* The true State of the Queſtion.

therin: Theſe examples are fraudulently heaped and hudled togeather by T. M. as though all were equally ſtood vpon by Catholicke writers, and this to the end that he may giue himſelf matter to anſwere afterward, as he doth by diſtinguiſhing that all doe not proue the ſelf ſame thing, nor were equally lawfull, nor done by equall authority or approbation, nor appertaine equally to the matter we haue in hād, which Catholicke writers alſo doe ſay, and haue taught him to ſay, though he diſſemble it, wherof we may read both *Cunerus*, *Carerius*, *Salmeron*, *Barkleius*, *Reginaldus* and *Boucherus*, here by him cited out of whome he hath taken the moſt part of that he writeth in this affaire.

27. Wheras then we muſt confeſſe with the Philoſopher and with reaſon it ſelf, that *Quidlibet ex quolibet non eſt conſequens*, euery thing followeth not of whatſoeuer, it ſeemeth that two pointes only of any moment, concerning the controuerſy in hand, may truly and ſincerly be deduced out of this number of examples now alledged: the firſt that as temporall authority of Princes is from God, and he will haue it reſpected and obeyed as from himſelf; ſo one way or other he faileth not to puniſh them grieuouſly, and to bring them oftentimes to great affliction and deſolation, when they gouerne not well, and this either by ordinary or extraordinary meanes, as himſelf liketh beſt. To which end is that ſeuere admonitiō in the ſecond Pſalme: *Et nūc Reges intelligite, & erudimini qui iudicatis terram: ſeruite Domino in timore, & exultate ei cum tremore. Apprehendite diſciplinam, nequando iraſcatur Dominus, & pereatis &c.* And now yow Kinges vnderſtand, and yow that gouerne the earth be inſtructed: ſerue almighty God in feare, and reioice vnto him with trembling. Admit diſcipline, leſt he fal into wrath againſt yow, & yow periſh &c. And this is the beſt & moſt pious meditatiō which a Chriſtian man can draw or lay before Princes,

Two principall pointes to be cōſidered in theſe examples of Kings punished.

Princes, out of thoſe diſaſterous euentes as fell to diuers by Godes owne apointment or permiſsion vnder the old Teſtament, and not the compariſon of Myters and Crownes which this Miniſter ridiculouſly bringeth in.

28. Secondly may be noted, that in the execution of Godes iuſtice & deſignement in this behalfe, he vſed alſo oftentimes the help & concurrence of both Prieſtes and Prophetes, & other holy men, who notwithſtanding may be preſumed out of their ſaid holy diſpoſition to haue abhorred ſuch effuſion of bloud, war, and other calamities, which by fulfilling Godes ordinance made vnto them, either by ſecret inſpiration or open commandment, were to enſue and follow, and conſequently that all Prieſtes were not debarred from dealing in ſuch affairs, when God required their cooperation therin. The true controuerſy.

29. All the queſtion then is how, and when, and where, and by whome, and for what cauſes, and in what caſes, & with what circumſtances, this reſtraint of Princes may be vſed, wherin I haue ſhewed abundantly before, that the moderation preſcribed by Catholickes is far greater, without compariſon, then is that of the Proteſtantes, whether we reſpect either their doctrine or practice, of which both kindes we haue before produced ſufficient examples: and in this place the Authors moſt alledged by T. M. about this controuerſy, againſt violence towardes Princes, are Catholicke, as namely *Cunerus*, a learned Biſhop of the low Countreys, in his booke, *De Officio Principis Chriſtiani*; and *Barkleius* a Reader of Law in *Loraine*, in ſix bookes written by him, *De Regno & Regali poteſtate aduerſus Monarchomacos*, Of Kingdome and Kingly power againſt impugners of Princes, the firſt writing againſt the Rebellions and violent attemptes of the ſubiectes of *Holland* and *Zeland*, and other Prouinces therunto annexed, *Supr. c. 1. 4* *Cuner. ep. Leouard.*

annexed, and by that occaſion treating in generall, how vnlawfull a thing it is for ſubiectes to take that courſe, vpon any diſcontentment whatſoeuer, handleth the matter very learnedly though briefly.

30. But the other Doctour *Barkley*, taking vpon him to treat the ſame matter much more largely, directeth his pen principally againſt the bookes of certaine Proteſtantes of our time, as *Hottoman*, *Brute*, *Buchanan*, and others before mentioned, for ſo he ſaith in his preface: *Non contentus Satanas iis, qui parens ille malorum & mendaciorum Lutherus &c.* Satan being not contéted with thoſe wicked doctrines which *Luther* the Father of all wickednes and lies, and other ſlanderous Railers, that came out of his kytchin, had with infamous mouthes and intolerable audacity vomited out againſt Princes, he ſent forth alſo into the world, to fly before mens eyes other moſt ſeditious bookes, *Hottomani Franco-Galliam*, *Bruti vindicias Tyrannorum*, *Bucchanani Dialogum de iure Regni*; the booke of *Hottoman* (dwelling in *Geneua*) intituled, *Free-France*, or the *Freedome of France* (to wit, of the Proteſtantes againſt their Kinges and Princes,) that other alſo of *Brutus* (a man of the ſame place and crew) intituled, *The reuenge that ſubiectes ought to take of their Princes if they become Tyrantes*; the third of *Buchanan*, (ſchoole-maiſter in times paſt to our Kinges Maieſty) intituled, *A Dialogue* of the right of Kingly power, ſubiecting the ſame to the people, yea and to euery priuate perſon therof, when it ſhall ſeeme vnto him neceſſary for the common-wealth, or expedient for Godes glory, as before yow haue heard. Againſt all which this Doctour *Barkley*, a Catholicke man writeth his ſix bookes; ſo as in this point for Princes ſecurity we are far more forward then Proteſtantes.

D. Barkley Prefac. ad Henr. 4. Gall. Reg.

Catholiks principall vvriters for the ſafty of Princes.

31. And albeit this ſaid Doctour doth include in like manner Doctour *Boucher* a French Catholicke writer, reprehending diuers thinges vttered by the ſaid

D. Boucher.

ſaid *Boucher* in his booke *De iuſta abdicatione*, againſt the late King *Henry* the third of *France*; yet in the principall point; whether priuate men, either for priuate or publicke cauſes, may vſe violence againſt their lawful Prince, not lawfully denounced for a publique enemy by the whole ſtate and common-wealth; in this point (I ſay) the ſaid *Boucher* is abſolutly againſt the ſame, & ſo proteſteth and proueth it by diuers argumentes, ſhewing himſelf therin to be quite contrary, and to abhorre not only the doctrine of *VVickcliffe* and *Huſſe* condemned in the Councell of *Conſtance* about that matter, but alſo of the forſaid Proteſtant writers *Hottoman, Brute, Bucchanan, Knox, Goodman, Gilby, VVhittingham* and the like: among whome alſo I may include *Iohn Fox*, who in his hiſtory of *Iohn Huſſe*, alloweth that propoſition of his; *Prelates and Princes leeſe their authority when they fall into mortall ſinne*; as the Author of the *VVarn-word* proueth more largely out of Fox himſelf.

See Boucher l. 3. c. 16.

Seſſ. 15.

VVarnvvord Encounter 2. ca. 3. n. 4. Fox mon. P. 564. 569.

32. And thus much for the firſt point, about examples drawne from the times of the old Teſtament, out of which, little cā be vrged to the proofe or diſproofe of this queſtion, beſides the two generall pointes by vs noted before. For to bring into diſputation, whether Prieſthood or Kingly principality had the vpper hand in that law, is to ſmall purpoſe, the matter being cleere, that as the Kinges (and ſo likewiſe their Captaines, Iudges, and Gouernours before they had Kinges) had the preheminence in all temporall affaires, ſo in ſpirituall: and ſuch as concerned God imediatly, the were referred principally to Prieſtes, and the temporall Magiſtrate commaunded to heare them, to take the law of them, & conſequently alſo the interpretation therof, to repaire vnto them in conſultation of doubtes, and to ſtand to their iudgment and definition; that Prieſtes and Prophetes ſhould conſult

The compariſon of Prieſthood and Kingly authority in the old lavv.

immediatly with God, and the Prince follow their word and direction.

33. And albeit God did ſome-times vſe for externall guiding and direction of Prieſtes and Prieſtly affaires, the authority of good Kinges in thoſe daies, eſpecially when they were Prophetes alſo, as *Dauid* & *Salomon*, in the correcting and remouing of ſome Prieſtes; yet this was extraordinary, and proueth not, that ſimply and abſolutly Kingly dignity and authority was aboue Prieſthood in that law, albeit alſo it be moſt true, which the Authors by this man heere alledged *Salmeron*, *Cunerus*, *Carerius* and the reſt doe note, that the Prieſthood of the old Teſtament was nothing comparable to that of the new, this deſcending directly from the perſon and office of Chriſt himſelf, and indued with farre higher and more powerfull ſpirituall authority for guiding of ſoules, then had the Prieſtes of the old law, which was but a figure of the new; & therfore to argue from that to this, is a plaine fallacy, and abuſing of the Reader.

34. Wherfore leauing this of the compariſon betweene Kinges and Prieſtes, of the old and new Teſtament, I will end this firſt point, with the very ſame concluſion (concerning the ſafty of Princes from violence of their ſubiectes) which our Aduerſary himſelf alledgeth out of our Catholicke Author *Cunerus* in theſe wordes: *VVe are taught* (ſaith he) from the example of the people of God, as your *Cunerus* teacheth, with great patience to endure the tyranny of mortall Kinges, yea when wee haue power to reſiſt, and becauſe they be next vnder God in earth, in all their iniuries, to commend their reuenge vnto God; nay he teacheth Kinges another excellent rule of pollicy, fitting for the preſeruation of all States, which is; *that he who ſucceedeth a King violently murdered of any, though of Godly zeale; yet ought he to reueng his Predeceſſours death*

Conf.p.13 » *Cun.de of. Princ.c.7.*

death by the death of the malefactours. So T.M. And now followeth that of the Ghospell *Ex ore tuo te iudico ſerue nequam:* for firſt I would aske him, is not this Catholicke doctrine? Is it not ours? doth he not heere call the Author therof *Cunerus, ours?* how then doth he affirme euery where, that our doctrine teacheth killing of Princes? Let him ſhew vs any of his Authors, that euer of this argument hath written ſo moderatly. Luc. 19.

35. And yet further I muſt aske him whether he will ſtand to the iudgment of this our *Cunerus*, when he commeth to the point indeed, *How incorrigible Princes in ſome caſes may lawfully be reſtrained, as alſo depriued by the Common-wealth, and conſent of the ſupreame Paſtour?* will he ſtand to this (I ſay) or rather fleet back againe to the doctrine of the Scottiſh, *Geneuian*, French, & Flemiſh Miniſters, when the King ſhould miſlike him, and eſpecially for his Religion? wherof I make little doubt, what euer he ſaith heere, finding himſelf and his at good eaſe. And finally I would aske him ſeriouſly, whether he would haue his Maieſty of England to practice that excellent rule of pollicy which he ſo highly comendeth out of our *Cunerus* (who notwithſtanding ſaith not a word therof by way of rule or obſeruation, but only affirmeth that *Amaſias* did iuſtly put to death thoſe ſeruantes of King *Ioas*, that vpon zeale had ſlaine him in his bed:) I would aske him (I ſay) whether indeed he would wiſh his Maieſty of England to put the ſame rule, and ſo highly commended pollicy in vſe, againſt ſuch as violently murdered, abetted or procured the ſame, againſt not only his Predeceſſours, but parentes and immediate Progenitours, Father, Mother, and Grand-mother? And then we know how many Miniſters, and their friendes would enter into that daunce; but theſe men frame their tongues according to times & fit occaſiõs. And with this he endeth his prooſes out of the old Teſtament. 4. Reg. 14. 2. Par. 24.

A demaunde made to T.M.

One

Out of the new Testament. §. 2.

Pag. 14. 36. AND then comming to the second part, he beginneth his discourse with this title: *The former question disputed according to the state of the new Testament*, and presently in our manner he giueth the onset with this proposition: *The Pope hath all absolute and direct power and dominion temporall ouer all Kinges and Kingdomes of the world &c.* And for proofe therof citeth *Carerius* and *Bozius* in the margent, and beginneth to lay forth their proofes; and then against these two that hold the opinion of Canonistes (wherof before we haue treated, to wit, that Christ was the immediate Lord of all temporalties, and consequently also is his substitute) he opposeth *Franciscus de Victoria*, *Bellarmine*, *Sanders*, and others that hold the other opinion, to wit that the Pope hath not directly, but indirectly only such authority to deale with Princes in temporall affaires: and so not informing his Reader that these are different opinions of the manner how the Pope hath this authority, but yet that both do agree in the thing it self that he hath it; he playeth pleasantly vpon the matter, and would make men thinke that he taketh vs at great aduantage, as contrary or rather contradictory among our selues: which indeed is no more cõtradiction, then if two Lawiers agreeing that such a noble man, had such an office or authority ouer such a Lordship, by succession from the Crowne, should differ only in this, whether the said office were giuen by the Prince, seuerally and expressely by particuler gift and writinges, or were giuen by a certaine consequence included in the gift of the said Lordship: The differẽce were nothing in the thing or certainty

An example expressing the state of the question.

of

of authority, but in the manner of hauing it, and ſo is it heere; and yet out of this difference of theſe two opiniõs, doth our Miniſter furniſh himſelf with good probability of argmentes on the one ſide, as though they were his owne, who otherwiſe would appeare very poore & pittiful therin. And this tricke he plaied before with the moderate Anſwerer, when he ſerued himſelf of the two differẽt opinions of ſome Deuines and Canoniſtes about the queſtion: *VVhether Heretiks before perſonall denuntiation, and ſentence giuen, be ſubiect to externall penalties appointed by the Canons:* And generally he runneth to this ſhift, more then any other commonly of his fellow-writers which I haue ſeene in theſe our dayes, to wit, that wherſoeuer he findeth any difference of opinions in diſputable matters betweene our Catholicke writers (which *S. Auguſtine* ſaith may ſtand with integrity of faith) there he ſetteth downe any one of theſe opinions for ours, and argueth againſt it with the argumentes of the other, or bringeth in the others authority & wordes againſt the ſame, which maketh ſome ſhew or muſter of matter on his ſide, wheras in deed and ſubſtance he hath nothing at all.

See before cap. 2.

Aug. l. 1. contr. Iul. cap. 2.

37. It were ouer long to examine in this place all the obiections which he putteth downe on our behalfe, vnder the ſecond head of our proofes, concerning the time of the new Teſtament, calling them *Romiſh pretences*, and the fond reſolutions he giueth vnto them; as firſt that we doe found the Popes temporall ſword vpon the keyes giuen by Chriſt to *S. Peter* and that it is a ſtrange art to make a ſword of a paire of keyes, which ſeemeth to him a fine ieſt; & then commeth he out with this vanut: *Neither can any ſhew me one Doctour, but of reaſonable antiquity* (peto vel ex millibus vnum) *who by keyes vnderſtand ciuill power:* But Syr what needeth antiquity of Doctors in this behalf? will not

Confut. pag. 15.

That keies may ſignify authority both ſpirituall and temporall.

your owne moderne Proteſtant Doctors graunt, that when the keyes of any Citty, Towne, or Fort are giuē to a Prince, ciuill power ouer that Fort is meant therby? who will deny this?

38. And ſecondly whereas he alleadgeth *Franciſcus à Victoria* to ſay that the keyes giuen to *S Peter* imported ſpiritual authority of remitting and reteyning ſinnes, *ergo* no way temporall, is a fond illation: for that albeit *Victoria* ſaith that thoſe keyes did principally importe ſpirituall authority; yet they include alſo ſupreme temporall indirectly, when the defence of the ſpirituall doth require it. Whereupon he frameth this concluſion in the ſame place: *Our eight propoſition is* (ſaith he) *that the Pope* (by authority of the foreſaid keyes) *hath moſt ample temporall power ouer all Princes and Kinges, and the Emperour himſelf, in order to a ſpirituall end*, which he proueth there by many arguments. And this of the firſt ieſt about ſwordes to be made of keyes.

39. The ſecond ieſt alſo is as wiſe and witty as this former, that when we found the ſame temporall ſword or authority of *S. Peter*, and his ſucceſſours vpon the words of Chriſt: *Feed my sheep*, he doth inferre that Princes alſo muſt be fed, and dietted corporally at the Popes diſcretion, and other ſuch toyes, he not vnderſtanding, as it ſeemeth, or rather diſſembling the force of Catholicke argumentes drawne from thoſe and other like Scriptures, both by later Doctors, and ancient Fathers, which this fellow turneth into ſcoſs and contempt, or wicked railing, for that preſently he falleth into theſe rages: *O arrogant Gloſſers! O impudent Gloſers, and peruerters of the ſacred Oracles of God!* And why is all this heat of exclamations? Forſooth for that in ſome Popes Bulles (though corruptly & fraudulently alledged) ſome mention is made of the great authority that was giuen to *Elias, Elizeus, Ieremy*, and other Prophetes, and eſpecially to Chriſt himſelf, vpon

Conf. p. 17

earth

earth to plant, deſtroy, pull vp, or puniſh where need ſhould be; and that this authority by alluſion vnto the ſame wordes of Scripture, is applied to Chriſtes Succeſſour vpon earth, & affirmed to be left in the Chriſtian Church, to be vſed when need ſhall require: and is this ſo great an impiety thinke yow?

40. But he goeth on and ſaith: *That next to this he will examine the antiquity of pretended Papall power from the Apoſtles time downward*, and then produceth this aſſertion of ours: *The Prieſtes (ſaith the Romish pretence) of the new Teſtament in the Prieſthood of Chriſt haue more authority then that of the old law ouer Kinges to depoſe them*, whervnto he adioyneth preſently his owne ſpruſe Miniſteriall anſwere in theſe wordes: *This is not probable except yow can shew ſome footinges either of Chriſt or his bleſſed Apoſtles, or their Holy Succeſſours in the purer periods of times.* And is not this anſwered as from a man of his coat? Marke the phraſe *Of footings in purer periods*, I will for footinges in this matter referre him to the large demonſtrations which out of Scriptures, Doctours, Fathers, Councelles, and Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtories, the Authors by him heere often alledged *Carerius, Bozius, Bellarmine, Sanders, Salmeron*, and others doe aboundantly and ſubſtancially alledge; & when he ſhall haue ouerthrowne or ſupplanted thoſe footinges of theirs, which they doe fix throughout *all periods of times* from the beginning of Chriſtian Religion vnto our dayes, and generall practice therof, then may the poore man get to haue ſome little footing for himſelf and his cauſe, which hitherto he hath none at all, as to any man whoſoeuer, with any indifferency of iudgment, ſhall read ouer and examine his booke, will euidently appear; yea though he compare but only that which himſelf alledgeth heere both in the text and margent, which ſeldome agree in true ſenſe if you marke it well. But if yow would examine the Latin authori-

The poore footings of Proteſtantes in periods of antiquity.

ties cited in the ſaid margent, with the originalles of the Authors themſelues, you ſhall ſcarce euer finde them ſincerly to agree, but that one fraud or other is vſed in their allegation, by chopping, changing, infarcing, leauing out, and other ſuch ſleightes and deceiptes, which though the breuity of this Treatiſe permit me not to examin, and lay forth at large in this place; yet ſome we haue touched before, and ſome others ſhall we haue occaſion to note afterwardes, and the Reader himſelf may vpon this warning make ſome little triall.

41. And as for the ſucceſsion of times, which this Author T. M. pretendeth to bring downe from the Apoſtles dayes, (not to ours) but for a thouſand yeares only after Chriſt, wherin he ſaith; *that no Pope can be shewed euer to haue had any temporall iuriſdiction ouer any Emperour, King, or temporall Prince*; though Catholickes doe hold the later ſix hundred yeares alſo, to be of no leſſe force for preſident of examples in the Church of God then the former thouſand, yet are the inſtances ſo many and euident, which may be alledged againſt his former preſcription of the ſaid thouſand yeares, as doe manifeſtly cõuince him of folly in that aſſertion, wherin I referre me to the collections and demonſtrations therof by the foreſaid Authors *Carerius*, *Bozius*, *Bellarmine*, *Sanders*, and others in the places heere quoted in the margent, but eſpecially to the three that are not Ieſuites, & to the firſt for all, to wit *Carerius*, that in diuers thinges wrote againſt the Ieſuits, whoe in his ſecond booke alleadgeth 10. or 12. examples out of antiquity for prouing his purpoſe. I remit me alſo to the many learned writinges, ſet forth of late about the cauſe of the *Venetians*, by *Penia*, *Baronius*, *Bouius*, *Eugenius*, *Nardus* & others, ſhewing the moſt euident right, which the Pope had, and hath to commaund them, as high Paſtor of the Church, to recall certaine ciuill

Carer. l. 2. de poteſtate Pont. c. 19. & 20.
Bell. c. de Rom. Pon.
Sande. l. 7. de Monar.
Bozius l. 5 de temporali Eccl. Mon. &c.

lawes

lawes made by them in preiudice of the ſaid Church, and Eccleſiaſticall State; which Commandement we doubt not but God will moue that moſt excellent Cõmon-wealth finally to * obey, they being knowne to be ſo good and ſound Catholickes, as they are, though for ſome time in regard of ſome temporall reſpectes they haue deferred to doe the ſame.

The cauſe of the Venetians.

* *Now they haue obeyed.*

42. Many more pointes might be examined in this deſcẽt of his throughout *periodes of times*; but it would be ouerlong, and my intention is to giue a taſt only or ſhort view: for to examine the places cited out of Fathers of diuers ages, for proofe of his pretence, were time wholy loſt. For that in effect they ſay nothing elſe, but that we graunt, which is that temporall Princes are to be reſpected and obeyed by Eccleſiaſticall men alſo, but in temporall affaires. And as for his examples of ſome Engliſh Kings that ſeemed not to reſpect much the Popes authority in ſome occaſions, which he hath borrowed out of *Syr Edward Cookes Reportes*, he may ſee the anſwere to that booke, and ſo I thinke remaine ſatisfied. Wherefore this ſhall ſuffice for the ſecond head of argumentes throughout the new Teſtament, though after alſo in the examination of ſome falſifications we ſhall haue occaſion to ſay more.

Argumentes from Reaſon. §. 3.

43. WHerfore to paſſe no further in the ſecond point of argumentes vnder the new Teſtament, we ſhall ſay a word or two only of the third, to wit of prooſes affirmed to be deduced by vs from force of reaſon, for ſo he intituleth them; to wit, *Po-*

pish Argumentes from reason. And to the end you may see his talent therin, wee shal examine only the third reason in this place which he declareth in these wordes:

Pag. 14. *Except, saith the Romish pretence, there were a way of deposing Apostata Princes, God had not prouided sufficiẽtly for his Church;* & for this he citeth the *Constitution Extrauagant* of Pope *Bonifacius*, and saith; *This obiection is in your Extrauagantes, and so it may be called, because it rangeth* extra, *that is without the bondes of Godes ordinance &c.* But as in all his other citations generally, he is neuer lightly true and sincere in all points, no not thrice (I thinke veryly) throughout all this lying booke of his; so neither heere: and it would require a great volume alone to examine only some part of his leaues about this point of his shiftes and corruptions; they are so many, and thicke and craftily hudled vp togeather. As for example heere, firſt this sentence is not in the Popes *Extrauagant* at all, but only in a certaine addition to the ordinary glosse or Commentary of *Iohn Picard*, which addition was made by *Petrus Bertrandus* a late writer. Secondly this Commentary saith nothing of deposing Apostata Princes, but only affirming the foresaid opinion of Canonistes to be true; *that Christ was Lord absolutly in this life ouer all, not only in spirituall authority, but in temporall also*; he inferreth therby Christ should not haue sufficiently prouided for the gouernment of his Church, & Kingdome vpon earth, *Nisi vnicum post se talem Vicarium reliquisset qui hac omnia posset*, except he had left some such one substitute or Vicar after him, as should be able to performe all these thinges, to wit, as belong both to spirituall and temporall power, according as necessity shall require: which later clause yow see, that T. M. cut of, as he added the other about *Apostata Princes*. And thus much for his variety of corruptions in this little sentence, now to the thing it selfe.

Extrauag. communium de maiorit. & obed. §. Vnam Sanctam.

The Extrauagant of Bonifacius 8. falsely alleadged.

Addit. ad comen. Extrauag. de maior. in c. 1. ad finem.

44. The reason if we consider it without passion, is strong

is ſtrong and weighty, and founded vpon the prouidence, wiſedome, and goodnes of almighty God, who hauing prouided diligently, and admirably for the preſeruation of all other thinges, and Communities by him created or ordained, ſhould leaue the Chriſtian Common-wealth vnfurniſhed of all remedy for the greateſt euill of all others, that poſsibly can fall out, which is the corruption of the head, that may deſtroy the whole body wherof he is head, if it be not redreſſed. As if (for examples ſake) the Prince would extirpate Chriſtian Religion, bring in Mahometiſme, or other ſuch abhomination, ouerthrow all good lawes, plant and eſtabliſh vice, diſſolution, Atheiſme, or commit ſome other ſuch exorbitant wickednes, as were not tolerable, wherunto notwithſtanding mans frailty, without the helpe of Godes grace, is, or may be ſubiect: In this caſe (ſaith the obiection) ſome remedy muſt haue byn left by Chriſt, or els his diuine wiſdome and prouidence had not prouided ſufficiently for the preſeruation of his Kingdome, as by light of nature he left remedy to the body of euery Common-wealth vnder the Gentiles before his cõming, which is euident both by *Plato*, *Ariſtotle*, *Cicero*, & others that wrote of Common-wealthes in thoſe dayes, and did alwayes preſume, that the ſaid Common-wealthes had ſufficient authority by law of nature to reſtraine exorbitant Princes, when they were perilous to the publicke: and the ſame haue held al other learned men that euer wrote of that argument afterward.

The great force of the former reaſõ.

Pla. Dial. 1. de repu. Ariſtot. 2. Polit. Cicer. 3. de leg. Bart. lib. de Tyrannide.

45. But as for our Catholicke learned men, both Deuines and Lawiers, though they affirme (as out of T. M. his frequent allegations of them in this his Treatiſe is euident) that all obedience both externall and internall, in conſcience and workes, is by Godes ordinance due vnto them; yet that in ſuch publicke perilles of the Church & Common-wealth as before

are

are mentioned, when they fal out, Christ our Sauiour hath not left his Church wholy remedilesse, but rather, that besides the naturall right which ech Kingdome hath to defend themselues, in certaine cases, he left also supreame power in his high Priest and immediate substitute, to direct and moderate that power, and to adde also of his owne, whē extraordinary need requireth, though with great deliberation, consultation, weighty motiues, lawfull meanes, and other like circumstances.

The Catholicke opinion & moderation about restraining euill Princes.

46. This, I say, is Catholicke doctrine, but what Protestants doctrine is, were hard to set downe: for that they speake therin as time and occasion serueth them, hauing no rule or Canon at all wherto they are bound. For what was both their doctrine and practice, when, and where they were discontented with their Princes, both in *England*, *Scotland*, *Flanders*, *Geneua* and *France*, is euident by that which before we haue alledged in the first & fourth Chapters of this booke: now this man telleth vs another tale for the time present, but what he would say or doe, if he were in the discontented occasion of those his fellow-Authors, that wrote so sharpely and violently, no man can tell: but let vs see now at length, how substantially he doth satisfy this obiectiō, for he giueth three or foure seuerall solutions therunto; you shall heare what ones they are.

Protestāts vncertainties.

47. The first is from Godes ordinance (saith he) for
» by the word of God, as your *Cunerus* Deuinely reasoneth, which is not partiall, nor by the self pleasing fancy of sensuall affection, must this question be determined; though therfore it may seeme to vs a decree of nature, for euery one to defend himself and the thinges he doth enioy; yet the Law of God doth forbid to doe this by taking armes against the higher powers &c. So T. M. out of our *Cunerus*. And it is well

Confut. pag. 35. The first answere.

well that he alloweth this Catholicke writer to reason deuinely, so far forth as he may seeme to make for him, though in truth in the cõclusion of his discourse, he is wholy against him. For as first his whole speech in this seauenth Chapter by him cited, is expressly against the *Hollanders*, that vnder diuers pretences, both of Religion, and Scriptures for the same liberty of their countrey, and the like, tooke armes against their true naturall King; which he reproueth, and condemneth very piously, and learnedly throughout this whole Chapter, and in the next ensuing, whose title is, *Quid in Tyrannide subditis agendum sit*; What subiectes ought to doe in case of tyranny, he sheweth two sortes of Tyranny and Tyrantes, the one that inuadeth vniustly another mans dominions against the will & authority of his King and Prince, the other that leauing the office of a King and good Prince in protecting his people, and Religion & iustice among them, turneth himselfe wholy to their affliction and oppression: and that in the former case, the people are taught by many examples of Scriptures, to resist by armes where they can; but in the second much more moderation is to be vsed, all meanes of humble suite, intreaty, intercession, prayer to God, amendment of life and pacification to be vsed; *Quod si hæc non iuuent* (saith he) *& Superiorem in temporalibus, vti Reges, Princeps non agnoscit, tunc supremus Ecclesiæ Pastor interpellandus occurrit, qui bonis & æquis subditorum querelis auditis, plura Deo cooperante ratione & auctoritate præstare poterit quàm vnquam populus armis impetrabit*; but if these meanes doe not help, saith *Cunerus*, and that the Prince doe acknowledge no Superiour in temporall causes, as Kinges doe not, then is the Supreme Pastor of the Church to be called vpon, who hauing heard the iust & good complaintes of the Subiects, God assisting him, shall be able to effectuate more by reason and authority with their Prince, then

B Cunerus drift against T. M. that alleadgeth him.

Tvvo sortes of tyranny and tyrantes.

Cuner. l. de officio Principis cap. 8.

euer the people themselues should haue obteyned by force of armes. Thus he.

48. And now, will T.M. allow this also for deuinely spoken? If he doe, then we differ not in opinion: If he doe not, why doth he so often, and continually cull out, and cut of sentences of Authors, that write directly against him, as this *Bishop Cunerus*, the Lawier *Carerius*, the Deuine *Bozius*, the Iesuites *Bellarmine*, *Salmeron*, *Azor*, and others? And yet I must admonish the Reader heere againe, that if he compare the text it selfe of *Cunerus* with that which heere T. M. setteth downe in Latin, and then the Latin with that he Englisheth, he shall find such mangling vpon mangling, by cutting of, leauing out, & altering whole sentēces, as he will see that this man can scarce deale truly in any thing. And thus much for his first answere out of *Cunerus*, making much more against him, then for him, as yow haue seene.

49. And I leaue to discusse the Authority of *S. Augustine* which out of *Cunerus* he also alleadgeth (for otherwise then out of our Authors bookes he hath little or nothing in any matter) it being no lesse mangled by this man, then is the text of *Cunerus* it selfe, as euery one will finde that shall read *Cunerus*; not so much as one note of [&c.] being left any where lightly, to signify that somewhat is cut of, but all running togeather, as if it were continuall speach in the Author; whereas in deed they be but peeces & scraps ioyned togeather, and those also commonly with much corruption: wherof I dare auouch that the Author shall finde aboue a hundred examples in this fraudulent Reply, which is wholy patched vp out of the distracted sentences of our owne Authors by this art.

Great fraude and corruptiō in mangling Authors.

50. But now to his second answere to the former obiection, *that Gods prouidence must needes haue left some remedy for the danger that may occurre by euill gouernment of*

The secōd answere.

Princes

Princes &c. The ſecond is (ſaith he) the conſideration of examples of the primitiue Church, when for the ſpace of three hundred yeares it was in grieuous perſecution, there was found no power on earth to reſtraine that earthly power, was therfore God wanting to his Church? God forbid. Nay rather he was not wanting, for it is written: *Vertue is perfected in infirmity.* And againe: *As gold is purged in the fire; ſo by affliction &c.* Becauſe *when the outward man ſuffereth, the inward man is renewed*, and *when I am weake, then am I ſtrong.* So he. And doe yow ſee how patient and meeke this man is become now, when there is nothing to ſuffer? did his Proteſtant-Authors before mencioned write or teach this doctrine whē they were preſſed by their Catholicke Princes to be quiet? Or if this ſhould be preached now at this day in *Holland, Zeland, Frizeland, Hungary, Polonia, Zweueland* & *Tranſiluania*, where actually Proteſtantes are in armes againſt their naturall and lawfull Princes, would it be receaued as currant and Euangelicall? Would the examples of primitiue martyrs, when there was ſcarce any temporall commonwealth extant among Chriſtians, be ſufficient to preſcribe a forme of patience & ſufferance to theſe men? Why doe they not then put it in practice? And why ceaſe they not, according to this mans doctrine from ſo notorious tumultuations againſt their lawfull Princes? Why is not this doctrine of the Scripture of perfecting their vertue by bearing and ſuffering admitted by them? I confeſſe it ought to be ſoe with all particuler men in their afflictions, oppreſsions, and tribulations, and ſo teach our Doctors, as before yow haue heard; though when the hurt and danger concerneth a common wealth eſtabliſhed in Chriſtian Religion, there be other conſiderations to be had, as before hath byn ſet downe.

Rom. 11. 1. Cor. 12. 2. Cor. 12. Dan. 3.

Great hypocriſy.

51. But Proteſtantes obſerue neither the one, nor

the other, but both in particuler and common, breake forth when they are ſtreyned or diſcontẽted, into the vttermoſt violence they can: and their Doctores are ready preſently to defend them; yea and to goe to the feild with them if need be againſt their Princes, as experience hath taught vs both in *Zwitzerland*, *Scotland*, *France*, and other places. Wherfore this pretended preaching of patience and ſufferance of T. M. in this place *both in his outward and inward man*, is to ſmall purpoſe.

The third anſvvere. Confut. p. 35. & 36.

52. Wherfore his third anſwere is to the former obiection *The view* (as he ſaith) *of our Popish principles*, wherby we teach, that the Pope may not be iudged by any perſon vpon earth, whether ſecular, or Eccleſiaſticall, nor by a General Councel, though he ſhould doe ſomething contrary to the vniuerſall State of the Church, neglect the Canons, ſpare offenderes, oppreſſe innocentes and the like: For which he citeth both *Bellarmine*, *Carerius* and *Azor*: and then addeth, that the Pope cannot be depoſed for any of theſe, *no not though* (ſaith he to vſe the wordes of your Pope himſelfe, one placed in the calendes of your martyrs) *he ſhould carry many people with himſelfe to hell; yet no mortall creature may preſume to ſay, why doe yow ſo.* Thus he.

Bellar. 2. de Rom. Pont. c. 26
Carer. l. 1. de poteſt. Pont. c. 3.
Azor Inſt. l. 5. c. 14.

53. Whervnto I anſwere firſt, that all which *Bellarmine*, *Carerius*, *Azorius*, and other Catholicke writers doe affirme of the Popes preheminency of authority immediatly vnder Chriſt, ſo as he hath no Superiour Iudge betweene Chriſt and him, that may ſit in iudgment ouer him, or giue ſentence vpon him for matters of yll life, tendeth only to ſhew, that as he receiueth his ſupreame charge immediatly from Chriſt, ſo by him muſt he be iudged, & not by man, though the ſame Authors in the ſame places (which this man of purpoſe omitteth and concealeth) doe expreſly affirme, that for the Crimes of Apoſtacy or hereſy he

Fraudulent dealing in T. M by concealemẽt.

may

may and muſt be depoſed, or rather is *ipſo facto* depriued of his office and dignity, and ſo may be declared by the Church in that caſe, to wit, aſwell by Princes and Potentates both Eccleſiaſticall and temporall, as by all Chriſtian people, who in that caſe are bound to concurre to his expulſion and depriuation. And albeit in the other of leſſer vices or infirmities of life, he haue no humaine Superiour to iudge him: yet is that of Chriſt himſelfe ſo much the more ſeuere, & dreadfull, and his holy prouidence hath byn euer and wilbe ſuch, as theſe perſonall defectes in his ſupreame Paſtor, ſhall not ſo much preiudicate his office, but that alwaies he ſhal teach his flocke that which may helpe them to their ſaluation, howſoeuer he liue himſelfe. Math.23. And of this he hauing forewarned vs with expreſſe premonition, the performance lieth vpon his charge whoſe power is omnipotent, and fidelity ſuch, as in his promiſes cannot poſsibly faile. And this to the firſt point.

The Pope may and muſt be depoſed for hereſy.

54. Now to the ſecond wherin he ſaith, *that one of our Popes, placed alſo in the Calends of our Martyrs, doth affirme that though a Pope ſhould carry many people with himſelfe to hell, no mortall man may preſume to ſay, why doe yow ſo?* I doe greatly maruaile with what conſcience, or if not conſcience, with what forehead at leaſt theſe men can write and print, and reiterate ſo often in their books, thinges that they know, or may know to be meerly falſe and forged! Is not this a ſigne of obſtinate wilfulnes, and that neither God, nor truth is ſought for by them, but only to maintaine a parte or faction, with what ſleight or falſhood ſoeuer? I find this very obiection ſet forth in print not many yeares gone by *Syr Francis Haſtings* in his *VVatch-word* and *Defence* therof, and the ſame auouched ſtoutly after him for a time by *Matthew Sutcliffe* the Miniſter, Aduocate & Proctor of that defence; but afterward I find the ſame ſo con-

futed at large by the *VVarn-word*, and ſo many lies, falſhoodes, and euident fraudes diſcouered therin, as the ſaid *M. Sutcliffe* in his Reply intituled *A full and round anſwere*, thought good roundly to let this paſſe, without any anſwere at all, which I can find in his ſaid booke, though I haue vſed ſome diligence in ſearch therof; which I doe adde, for that he changeth the whole order of anſwearing from the method of his Aduerſary, to the end not to be found, & ſo anſwereth nothing in order or place, as it is ſet downe by him whome he pretendeth to anſwere, but rather taking a new, vaſt and wild diſcourſe to himſelfe, ſnatcheth heere a word, and there a word, to carpe at, not as they ly in his aduerſaries booke, but as it pleaſeth him to admit them, now from the end of the booke, then from the beginning, then from the middle: and with this ſubſtantiall methode, he taketh vpon him to anſwere all bookes that come in his way; for ſo he hath anſwered of late the booke alſo of *Three Conuerſions of England*, and may doe eaſely all that is written by Catholickes, if carping only and ſcolding be anſwering.

Shameles facing of vntruthes.

A note of M. Sutcliffs manner of anſvvering.

55. Wherfore to this inſtance heere reſumed by T. M. though I muſt remit him, or rather the Reader for larger ſatisfaction to the ſaid Catholike Treatiſe, intituled *The VVarn-word*; yet heere breifly I am to tell him firſt, that he erreth groſſely in the affirming in this place, the Author of this Canon cited by him *Si Papa*, to haue byn a Pope, for that the ſaid Canon was gathered by *Gratian* out of the ſayinges of *S. Boniface* martyr, as in the title of the ſaid Canon is expreſſed, which Boniface was neuer Pope, but a vertuous learned Engliſh man, that liued aboue 850. yeares gone, and was the firſt Archbiſhop of *Mentz* or *Moguntia* in *Germany*; of which people and countrey he is called by all ancient writers *The Apoſtle*, for that he firſt publickly conuerted that nation, erected that Primate

VVarn-word, Encounter 2. c. 13. num. 18. 19. 20. &c.

The error about S. Boniface the Engliſh martyr.

Sea,

ſea, and ſuffered glorious martyrdome by the Gentils for the faith of Chriſt. Wherfore the ſcoffe of T. M. calling him *our Pope placed in the Calendes of our martyrs*, beſides the ignorance, taſteth alſo of much prophane malice and impiety.

56. Secondly I ſay that theſe wordes of his are corruptly ſet downe, as euer commonly elſwhere, and that both in Latin and Engliſh. In Latin, for that he leaueth out the beginning of the Canon, which ſheweth the drift therof, whoſe title is: *Damnatur Apoſtolicus qui ſuæ & fraternæ ſalutis eſt negligens*: The Pope is damned which is negligent in the affaire of his owne ſaluation and of his brethren; and then beginneth the Canon *Si Papa ſuæ & fraternæ ſalutis negligens &c.* Shewing that albeit the Pope haue no Superiour Iudge in this world, which may by authority checke him vnleſſe he fall into hereſy; yet ſhall his damnation be greater then of other ſinners, for that by reaſon of his high dignity, he draweth more after him to perdition, then any other. Wherby we may perceaue that this Canon was not written to flatter the Pope, as Proteſtantes would haue it ſeeme, but to warne him rather of his perill, togeather with his high authority.

57. After this the better to couer this pious meaning of *S. Boniface* T. M. alleadging two lines of the ſame in Latin, he cutteth of preſently a third line, that immediatly enſueth, to wit: *Cum ipſo plagis multis in æternum vapulaturus*, that the Pope is to ſuffer eternall punishmentes, and to be ſcourged with many ſtripes, togeather with the diuell himſelfe, if by his euill, or negligent life, he be the cauſe of others perdition; which threat this man hauing cut of, he ioineth preſently againe with the antecedent wordes, theſe as following immediatly in the Canon; *Huius culpas redarguere præſumet nemo mortalium*; this mans faultes (to wit

A heape of falſities.

wit the Pope) no mortall man ſhall or may preſume to reptehend, and there endeth. In which ſhort phraſe are many fraudes: for firſt he leaueth out *iſtic* heere in this life, and then for *præſumit* in the preſent tenſe, that no man doth preſume to checke him in reſpect of the greatnes of his dignity, this man ſaith *præſumet*, in the future tenſe, that is no man ſhall preſume, or as him ſelfe tranſlateth it *may preſume* to controlle him, which is a malitious falſhood. And laſtly he leaueth out all that immediatly followeth conteyning a reaſon of all that is ſaid: *Quia cunctos ipſe iudicaturus, à nemine eſt iudicandus, niſi deprehendatur à fide deuius &c.* For that wheras he is Iudge of all other men, he cannot himſelfe be Iudged by any, except he be found to ſwarue from the true faith. Heere then is nothing but fraudulent citing, and abuſing of Authors.

58. But now thirdly remaineth the greateſt corruption & abuſe of all in his Engliſh tranſlation, which is that which moſt importeth his ſimple Reader that looketh not into the Latin, and this is, that he tranſlateth the former ſentence of the Canon thus as before yow haue heard: *Though he ſhould carry many people with him to hell; yet no mortall creature may preſume to ſay why doe yow ſo?* But in the Latin neither heere, nor in the Canon it ſelfe is there any ſuch interrogation at all, *as why doe yow ſo?* And therfore I may aske T. M. why doe yow ly ſo? Or why doe yow delude your Reader ſo? Or why do yow corrupt your Author ſo? Or why doe yow tranſlate in Engliſh for the abuſing of your Reader, that which neither your ſelfe doe ſet downe in your Latin text, nor the Canon it ſelfe by yow cited hath it at all? Is not this wilfull, and malicious fraude? Wherin when yow ſhall anſwere me directly and ſincerly, it ſhall be a great diſcharge of your credit with thoſe, who in the meane ſpace will iuſtly hold yow for a deceauer.

Great impudency.

59. His

59. His fourth answere to the former argument of Gods prouidence, is the difference (he saith) of Kings and Popes in this point, *for that the Papall power* (saith he) *which will be thought spirituall if it be euill, may be the bane of soules; the power of Princes is but corporall, therfore feare them not because they can goe no further then the body.* Thus he. And did euer man heare so wise a reason? And cannot euill Kinges and Princes be the cause of corrupting soules also if they should liue wickedly, & permit or induce others to doe the same? And what if they should be of an euill Religion as yow will say *Q. Mary*, and *K. Henry* were, and all Kinges vpward for many hundred yeares togeather, who by Statutes and lawes forced men to follow the Religiõ of that time, did all this touch nothing the soule? who would say it but T.M? But he goeth forward in his application, *for that bodily Tyranny* (saith he) *worketh in the Godly patience, but the spirituall Tyranny doth captiuate the inward soule.* This now is as good as the former, and is a difference without diuersity, so farre as concerneth our affaire; that a man may with patience, if he will, resist both the one and the other. And euen now we haue seene that when any Pope shal decline from the common receaued faith of Christendome, he cannot captiuate other men, but is deposed himselfe. Wherfore this mans conclusion is very simple, saying: *Therfore heere is need, according to Gods prouidence, of power to depose so desperate a spirituall euill, wherof it is written, if the salte want his saltenesse, it is good for nothing, but to be cast vpon the donghill. Marke then that concerning the spirituall, that God hath ordeined* eiiciatur foras, *let it be cast out; but concerning the temporall*, resiste not the power.

His fourth answere.

Confut. p. 3. & 36.

Impertinent reasons.

Math. 5.

Rom. 13.

60. Lo heere, and doe not these men find Scriptures for all purposes? This fellow hath found a text, that all spirituall power, when it misliketh them, must be cast to the donghill, and no temporall must be resisted;

and yet he that ſhall read the firſt place by him alleadged out of *S. Matthew* ſhall find that the lacke of ſalteneſſe is expreſly meant of the want of good life and edification, eſpecially in Prieſtes and Preachers; and yet is it no precept, as this man would haue it, to caſt them al to the donghill: but that ſalte leeſing his taſte, is fit for nothing but to that vſe. *S. Paul* in like manner to the *Romanes* doth not more forbid reſiſting of temporall authority, then of ſpirituall: but commaundeth to obey both the one and the other; which this man applieth only to temporall, which he would haue exalted, obeyed, and reſpected, and the other contemned, and caſt to the donghill. Oh that he had byn worthy to haue byn the ſcholler of *S. Chryſoſtome*, *S. Gregory Nazianzen*, or *S. Ambroſe* before cited, who ſo highly preferred ſpirituall authority before temporall, how would they haue rated him, if he would not haue byn better inſtructed, or more piouſly affected? No doubt *eieciſſent foras*, they would haue caſt him forth to the donghill in deed, and there haue left him, and ſo doe we in this matter, not meaning to follow him any further, except he reaſoned more groundedly, or dealt more ſincerly.

61. Yet in one word to anſwere his compariſon, we ſay, that both temporall, & ſpirituall Magiſtrates may doe hurte both to body and ſoule: for as the temporall may preiudice alſo the ſoule, as now hath byn ſaid; ſo may the ſpirituall afflict in like manner the body, as when the Pope or Biſhoppes doe burne Heretikes: ſo as in this reſpect, this diſtinction of T. M. is to no purpoſe; yet doe we alſo ſay, that when ſpirituall authority is abuſed, it is more pernicious, & preiudiciall then the other: *Quia corruptio optimi eſt peſſima*: The beſt thinges become worſt, when they are peruerted: and ſpirituall diſeaſes, eſpecially belonging to faith, be more pernicious then corporall: for which cauſe God had

Much leſſe dangerous to haue one Pope vvithout all Superior, then many Princes.

had so much care to prouide for the preuention therof in his Christian Church, for the conseruation of true faith, by the authority, vnion, visibility, & succession of the said Church, and diligence of Doctores, Teachers, Synodes, Councels, and other meanes therin vsed, and by his assistance of infallibility to the head therof: which head though in respect of his eminent authority, he haue no Superiours to Iudge or chastise him, except in case of heresy, as hath byn said; yet hath he many and effectuall meanes wherby to be admonished, informed, stirred vp, and moued: so as he being but one in the world, and furnished with these helpes, bringeth farre lesse danger, and inconuenience, then if all temporall Princes (who are many) had the like priuiledge and immunity. And this euery reasonable man out of reason it selfe will easily see & consider.

62. As also this other point of no small or meane importance, to wit, that English Protestantes pretending temporall Princes to be supreame, and without Iudge or Superiour in matters of Religion, as well as ciuill and secular, they incurre a farre greater inconuenience therby, then they would seeme to lay vpon vs. For that if any temporall Prince as Supreame in both causes, would take vpon him the approbation, or admission of any sect or heresy whatsoeuer, they haue no remedy at all according to the principles of their doctrine; wheras we say, the Pope in this case may and must be deposed by force of his subiectes, & all Christian Princes ioined togeather against him: so as in place of one generall Pope, which in this case is vnder authority, they make so many particuler Popes, as are particuler Kings & temporall Princes throughout all Christendome, that are absolute, and consequently without all remedy for offences temporall or spirituall in manners or faith.

63. And now let vs imagine what variety of sectes

and ſchiſmes would haue byn at this day in Chriſtianity, if for a thouſand and ſix hundred yeares, which Chriſtian Religion hath endured, this doctrine of liberty and immunity of temporall Princes to belieue, hold, and defend what they liſt, had byn receaued and practiſed for good and currant vnto this time. From which ſinguler inconuenience, danger, and deſperate deſolation, the doctrine & beliefe of the only Biſhop of *Rome* his Supreame authority, and exerciſe therof, hath chiefly deliuered vs, as to all men is euident. And this only reaſon were ſufficient in all reaſon to refute this mans ydle confutation of that Supremacy heere pretended; which confutation ſtanding vpon ſo feeble and ridiculous groundes, as now in part yow haue ſeene, & ſupported principally by certaine new ſhifts, and iugglinges ſcarcely vſed by any before, by caſting out ſhaddowes of our Catholicke Authors ſayinges and ſentences, as making for him; though I meane to paſſe no further in impugning his ſaid grondes, which are of ſo ſmall weight as yow haue ſeene: yet doe I not thinke it amiſſe to adde another ſeuerall Chapter for better diſcouering of the ſaid iugglinges vſed by him in this ſhort Treatiſe, not conteyning much aboue twenty leafes in all. For by this little yow may gather what a volume might be framed of his falſe dealings, if we would dwell any longer therin.

A BRIEF

A BRIEF VIEVV OF CERTAINE NOTORIOVS, FALSE AND FRAVDVLENT DEALINGS, VSED BY T. M.

In this his short ſeuerall Treatiſe againſt the Popes Supremacy:

As alſo ſundry examples of the like proceeding in the former Part of his deceiptfull Reply.

CHAP. VI.

IT is the ſaying both of Philoſophers and Deuines, *Bonum niſi bene fiat, bonum non eſſe*, A good thing except it be well & rightly done, is not good: As for example if a man would relieue the neceſsity of poore and diſtreſſed people with almes gotten by ſtealth or robbery; albeit giuing of alms of it ſelfe be a

good thing; yet for that it is not heere lawfully perfor-
The fraud of T.M. med, in this caſe it is not good nor lawfull: So *M. Thomas Morton* taking vpon him to confute the Popes Supremacy ouer Kinges and Princes, thought no doubt to doe a good worke therin, at leaſt-wiſe *bonum vtile*, a profitable good thing for himſelf, in regard of ſome fauour or beneuolence which he might hope to gaine with ſome Prince therby to his preferment; but not performing the ſame by lawfull meanes of truth, but of ſleightes (notwithſtanding to his Maieſty he tearmeth himſelf *the Miniſter of ſimple truth*) though it ſhould proue *vtile*, yet not *honeſtum*; that is, for his gaine, but not for his credit or conſcience, and conſequently deſerueth rather diſgrace then eſtimation, euen with thoſe whome moſt he deſired to gratify in that affaire.

2. For demonſtration wherof, though I ſuppoſe to haue ſaid ſufficient before, both in the ſecond, fourth, and fifth Chapters by occaſion of matters that occurred in diſcuſsion betweene vs; yet now hauing determined with my ſelf, to paſſe on no further in the particuler refutatiõ of this his Treatiſe, as a thing not worth the time to be loſt therin, and handled far better by diuers of his owne ſide before him, namely by
The vanity of T.M. his vaunt of truth. *M. Iewell, M. Horne, D. Iohn Reinoldes, M. Bilſon* and ſome others in their bookes of this ſubiect; I thought good notwithſtanding for ſome kinde of recompence of this my breuity in anſwering ſo ſimple and idle a Treatiſe, to ad ſome few examples more in this place of other corruptions and falſifications practized by him in this his confutation: not of all, for that alone would require a great booke, but of ſome competent number, wherby the Reader may gheſſe at the reſt; & his Maieſty take ſome proofe of the extraordinary vanity of that vaunt, wherwith he preſented himſelf to his Highnes, in the very firſt entrance of his Epiſtle dedica-

dedicatory, *in so constant assurance of an vpright conscience* (to vse his owne wordes) *as that he would willingly remit that iust aduantage against his aduersary, which the difference betweene a Minister of simple truth, and a professed Equiuocator did offer vnto him.* Now then let vs enter to the examination it self.

3. Wherin only the Reader is to be aduertised, that wheras this man by a new deuise of his owne, doth pretend to put downe the sayings of our Catholicke writers for his purpose, and that both in Latin and English, the one in the text, and the other in the margent, pretending therby to make them speake cõtrary one to the other, *A course* (saith he to the Kinges Maiesty) *which I professe in all disputes*; he dealeth so perfidiously therin to bring them to debate, as commonly the simple fellow committeth three seuerall sortes of fraudes and falshood in most of his allegations. First in corrupting the meaning of the Authors, alledging them quite against their owne whole drift, and intended discourse, and conclusion therof. Secondly in setting downe fraudulently the Latin text, by peecing & patching their sentences togeather that stand farre a sunder in the Authors themselues, & by dismembring others that were coherent before, as often now wee haue complained. Thirdly in translating the same by like fraude into English, vsing manifest violence to the wordes and sense it selfe, to get therby some shew of aduantage, or at least-wise to say somewhat. All which sortes and kindes of shifts yow shall see expressed in the examples that are to ensue.

A new fraudulẽt deuise of T. M. vvherof he braggeth.

4. In the second page of his pretended confutation; he hath these wordes; *In the old Testament the Iesuites are forced to allow, that the King was supreame ouer the Priestes in spirituall affaires and ordering Priestes.* For proofe wherof he citeth in the margent *Salmeron* a Iesuit, a very learned man, that hath left written in our

The first example.

Pag. 2.

in our dayes many volumes vpon the Ghospells, Epistles of *S. Paul*, and other partes of Scriptures, and was one of the first ten, that ioined themselues with the famous holy man *Ignatius de Loyola*, for the beginning of that Religious order; in which citation diuers notable corruptions are to be seene. First, for that *Salmeron* proueth the quite contrary in the place by this man quoted, to wit, that neuer Kinges were head of the Church or aboue Priestes by their ordinary Kingly authority in Ecclesiasticall matters, in the new or old Testament, and hauing proued the same largly, he commeth at length to set downe obiections to the contrary, and to solue & answere them, saying:

Salmer. disp. 12. in Epistolas Pauli in gen. §. sed contra.

» *Sed contra hanc solidam veritatem &c.* But now against
» this sound truth by me hitherto confirmed, I know
» that many thinges may be obiected, which we are
» diligently to confute. First then may be obiected that
» Kinges in the old Testament did sometimes prescribe
» vnto Priestes what they were to doe in sacred thin-
» ges, as also did put some negligent Priestes from the
» execution of their office. To which is answered: *Vbi*
» *id euenisset, mirum esse non debere*; If it had so fallen out, it
» had byn no maruaile: for that the Synagogue of the
» Iewes, albeit it conteined some iust men, yet was it
August. l. 19. contr. Faust. c. 31. in princ. called rather an earthly, then a heauenly Kingdome,
insomuch as *S. Augustine* doth doubt, whether in the
old Testament, the Kingdome of heauen was euer so
» much as named, and much lesse promised for reward;
» and therfore those things that were then done amõg
» them, foreshewed only or prefigured diuine thinges
» that were to succeed vnder the new Testament, the
» other being not diuine but humane and earthly. So
Salmeron.

2. Corruption about the meaning.

5. Heere then are sundry important corruptions, & fraudes vttered by T. M. the one that the Iesuites, and namely *Salmeron*, are inforced to allow the temporall

King

King to haue byn Supreme ouer the high Prieſt in ſpirituall matters, vnder the old law; wheras he doth expreſſely affirme and prooue the contrary, both out of the Scripture it ſelfe, by the ſacrifice appointed more worthy for the Prieſt, then the Prince, & many other teſtimonies, as that he muſt take the law & interpretation therof at the Prieſtes hands, that he muſt *ingredi & egredi ad verbum Sacerdotis*, goe in and out, and proceed in his affaires by the word and direction of the Prieſt, and the like; as alſo by the teſtimony of *Philo* and *Ioſeph*, two learned Iewes, and other reaſons handled at large in this very diſputation, and in the ſelf ſame place from whence this obiection is taken. And this is the firſt falſification concerning the Authours meaning and principall drift.

* *Diſp.* 12. *pag.* 324. & 325.

Leuit. 4.

Deut. 17.

Num. 27.

Philo l. de victimis par. 2. *circa mediũ Ioſeph.* 3. *Antiquit. cap.* 10.

6. The ſecond corruption is in the wordes, as they ly in the Latin copy, & as they are by me before mentioned: *Vbi id euenisſet mirum eſſe non debere*, If any ſuch thing had fallen out, as was obiected, to wit that Kinges ſometimes had preſcribed to the Prieſts what they ſhould doe in Eccleſiaſticall things, depoſed ſome &c. it had byn no maruaile, for ſomuch as their Eccleſiaſticall Kingdome or Synagogue was an earthly and imperfect thing, but yet this proueth not that it was ſo, but only it is ſpoken vpon a ſuppoſition: which ſuppoſitiõ this Miniſter that he might the more cunningly ſhift of and auoid, left cut of purpoſe the moſt eſſentiall wordes therof *Vbi id euenisſet* if that had happened &c. as alſo for the ſame cauſe to make thinges more obſcure, after thoſe words of *Salmeron* that ſtand in his text: *Synagoga Iudeorum dicebatur terrenum potius quàm cæleſte regnum*; The Synagogue or Eccleſiaſticall gouernment of the Iewes, was called rather an earthly then a heauenly Kingdome (wheras contrary-wiſe the Eccleſiaſticall power in the Chriſtian Church is euery where called Celeſtiall) after thoſe wordes (I

2. Corruptiõ about the vvordes.

ſay) this man cutteth of againe many lines that followed, togeather with *S. Auguſtines* iudgmēt before touched, which ſerued to make the Authors meaning more plaine, and yet left no ſigne of (*&c.*) wherby his Reader might vnderſtand that ſomewhat was omitted, but ioineth againe preſently, as though it had imediatly followed, *Itaque cùm populus Dei conſtet corpore & animo, carnalis pars in veteri populo primas tenebat:* Whereas Godes people doth conſiſt of body and minde, the carnall or bodily part did cheifly preuaile among the Iewes, and heerwith endeth, as though nothing more had enſued of that matter, thruſtnig out theſe wordes that immediatly followed, and made the thing cleere which are, *Et ad ſpiritualia ſignificanda conſtituebatur*, and that kinde of earthly power was appointed to ſignify the ſpirituall that was to be in the new Teſtament: wherby is euidently ſeene that *Salmeron* vnderſtood not by *carnalis pars* and *regnum terrenum*, the temporall Kingdome of *Iury*, as this Miniſter doth inſinuate to make the matter odious; but the Eccleſiaſticall gouernment of the Synagogue vnder the old law, in reſpect of the Eccleſiaſticall power in the new, wherof the other was but an earthly figure or ſignification.

Sundry ſleightes.

7. But now the third corruption, & moſt egregious of all, is in his Engliſh tranſlation out of the Latin wordes of *Salmeron*: for thus he tranſlateth them in our name: *In the Synagogue of the Iewes* (*ſaith* Salmeron) *was a State rather earthly then heauenly; ſo that in that people (which was as in the body of a man, conſiſting of body and ſoule) the carnall part was more eminent, meaning the temporall to haue byn ſupreame.* In which tranſlation are many ſeuerall ſhifts and fraudes. For wheras *Salmeron* ſaith *Synagoga Iudeorum dicebatur potius terrenum quàm cæleſte regnum*, the Synagogue or Eccleſiaſticall power among the Iewes was called rather an earthly, then a heauenly Kingdome; he tranſlateth it, *the Synagogue of the Iewes was a*

3. Corruptiō about the tranſlation.

Confut. pag. 2.

State

State rather earthly, then heauenly; and this to the end he might apply the word of *earth* to the temporal Prince, and *heauenly* to the Iudaicall Prieſtes, which is quite from *Salmerons* meaning. Secondly thoſe other wordes of *Salmeron* being *Cùm populus Dei conſtet ex corpore & animo*, wheras the people of God doe conſiſt of body and minde, meaning therby aſwell Chriſtians as Iewes, and that the Iewes are as the bodily or carnall part of the man, and the Chriſtians the ſpirituall, and conſequently their Eccleſiaſticall authority earthly, and ours heauenly; this fellow to deceaue his Reader, putteth out firſt the word *Dei*, the people of God and then tranſlateth it, *in that people* (to wit the Iewes) *the carnall part was the more eminent*, *meaning* (ſaith he) *the tẽporall*; which is falſe, for he ſpeaketh expreſſely of the Eccleſiaſticall power among the Iewes, which he calleth carnall and terrene, in reſpect of the ſpirituall Eccleſiaſticall among the Chriſtians, and not the temporall or Kingly power vnder the old Teſtament, as this man to make vs odious to temporall Princes, as debaſing their authority, would haue it thought. And *Salmerons* cõtrapoſition or antitheſis is not betweene the *temporall* and *Eccleſiaſticall* gouernment among the Iewes; but betweene their Eccleſiaſticall gouernment and ours, that of the Synagogue, and this of the Chriſtian Church, wherof the one he ſaith to be terrene & earthly, the other ſpirituall and heauenly, the one infirme, the other powerfull ouer ſoules &c. So as all theſe ſortes and kindes of corruptions being ſeene in this one little authority, yow may imagine what will be found in the whole booke, if a man had ſo much patience and time to leeſe, as to diſcuſſe the ſame exactly through.

Malitious interpretations to make vs odious.

8. A little after this againe, he bringeth in an example of the King of Iſraell *Ozias*, who for preſuming to exerciſe the Prieſts office in offering of incenſe, being

The ſecõd example pag. 7.

first reprehended, and resisteſt for the same by *Azarias* the high Prieſt, and foureſcore other Prieſtes with him in the Temple, was for his preſumption preſently and publickly in all their ſightes puniſhed by God, and ſtroken with a leproſy, and therupon remoued by the authority of the ſaid high Prieſt, firſt from the Temple, and common conuerſation of men, and then alſo from the gouernment or adminiſtration of his Kingdome, the ſame being committed to his ſonne *Ioathan* all the dayes of his Fathers life: about which example, *M. Morton* firſt of all bringeth in *Doctor Barkley* diſſenting from *Doctor Boucher* in this matter, about the depoſition of this King, the one holding that he was depoſed, the other not, but only that as a ſicke man was debarred of the adminiſtration. *Doctor Bouchers* wordes are theſe cited by *D. Barkley*: *Sic Oziam Azarias de Templo primùm, mox etiam de Regno eiecit.* So *Azarias* the high Prieſt did caſt out King *Ozias*, firſt frō the Temple, and then from his Kingdome. Which the other will not haue to be vnderſtood that the title and intereſt of his Kingdome was taken from him, but only the adminiſtration, which in effect is no great difference of opinions; for that *Bellarmine* alſo talking of this matter ſaith: *Cùm regni adminiſtratione priuatus fuerit*, wheras he was depriued of the adminiſtration of the Kingdome, which after in other words he expreſsing, ſaith, *Regnandi authoritate*, he was depriued of the authority of actual raigning, or exerciſing that authority: wherunto the wordes of the Scripture ſeene plainly to agree, which are theſe: *Feſtinatò expulerunt &c. Azarias and the reſt of the Prieſtes did haſtily driue him out of the Temple, and he himſelf being terrified with that which he felt to be the punishment of God, made haſt to goe forth. Wherfore this King* Ozias *remaining a leper vnto the day of his death, did dwell in a ſeparate howſe, and he was full of leproſy, for the which he was caſt forth of the howſe of our Lord: ſo as his ſonne* Ioathan

4. Reg. 15. 2. Par. 26.

A contention about the expulſion of K. Ozias.

Barkleius l. 5. c. 11.

Bell. l. 5. de ſummo Ponti. c. 8.

2. Par. 26.

Ioathan *did gouerne the howse of the King, & iudge the people of the land.*

9. Out of which wordes of Scripture as also out of the Booke of *Leuiticus*, where the law saith, *That whosoeuer shalbe spotted with leprosy, and is separated at the apointment of the Priest, shall dwell alone without the tentes*, *Bellarmine* doth gather that this separation of King *Ozias* was not voluntary but by prescript order of the said high Priest *Azarias*, and that consequently he was depriued also by the same sentence and authority, of his gouernment and administration of the Kingdome; against which T. M. bringeth in a great tempestuous storme of wordes, and warre of the foresaid *Doctor Barkley* Scottishman, against Cardinall *Bellarmine*, as though he had refuted him with some contumely and contempt; wheras *Doctor Barkley* neither nameth nor meaneth *Bellarmine*, but only *Boucher* vpon his wordes before recited, against whome he being, according to his custome, somewhat vehement in speech (the difference in substance being little or nothing as yow haue seene) T. M. endeauoreth by his sleightes to increase or aggrauate the same. For wheras *Doctor Barkley* presuming *Boucher* to vnderstand by those his wordes *De regno eiecit*, that *Azarias* had taken from K. *Ozias* the name and right of Kingdome, saith vnto him; *Magna sanè imprudentia vel impudentia est, ea scriptis mandare, quæ manifestis scripturæ testimoniis redarguuntur*: It is truly a great imprudence or impudēcy, to cōmit those thinges to writing which are controlled by manifest testimonies of Scripture; There our Minister blotteth out in his Latin text the word *imprudentia*, and will haue only to stand *impudentia* to set them further out then they be, which me thinkes was some *impudency* also in him; and againe when the said *Barkley* writeth immediatly after the former wordes; *Malo te negligentiæ quàm nequitiæ reum facere*, I had rarher accuse

Leuit. 13.

Dealings of a malebate.

you of negligence then of malice; theſe wordes alſo not without ſome malice T. M. ſtriketh out, and pittifully mangleth the whole diſcourſe, putting in and putting out at his pleaſure, and yet all ſet downe in his booke as the continuall ſpeech of the Author.

10. Heere then yow ſee how many wilfull corruptions there be, firſt to bring in *Doctor Barkley* rating of Cardinall *Bellarmine* with *magna ſanè impudentia eſt &c.* Wheras he talketh not againſt *Bellarmine* at all, nor indeed is *Bellarmines* manner of ſpeech contrary to that which *Barkley* will haue to be the meaning of the Hiſtory; for that *Barkley* doth not ſo much ſtand vpon the thing in controuerſy for Prieſtes authority, but vpon the manner of proofe by the examples alledged by *D. Boucher* of *Ieroboam*, *Ozias*, *Athalia*, and ſome other Princes, in whoſe puniſhment God vſed Prieſtes for meanes and inſtrumentes. *Non ignoro* (ſaith he) *Ius eſſe Eccleſiæ in Reges & Principes Chriſtianos, nec quale ius ſit ignoro, ſed id tam alienis argumentis oſtendi prorſus ignoro; imò non oſtendi planè ſcio*: I am not ignorant, ſaith *Doctor Barkley*, that the Church hath right ouer Chriſtian Kinges & Princes, nor am I ignorant what manner of right it is; yet doe I not ſee how the ſame may be proued by ſuch impertinent argumentes; nay I know rather that it cannot be ſo proued. Which wordes going but very few lines before thoſe that T. M. alledgeth, he could not but ſee, and yet left them out, and then beginneth againſt vs his Engliſh text thus: *Your owne Doctor calleth this your aſſertion moſt falſe, and contrary to the direct Hiſtory of the Byble*, to wit, that *Ozias* was depoſed of his Kingdome by *Azarias* the high Prieſt.

Enumeration of falſities.

Ibid. c. 11.

11. But now yow haue ſeene that howſoeuer it may be called, either depoſition, depriuation, reſtraint, ſequeſtration or inhibition; certaine it is, that he was ſeparated from the adminiſtration of the gouernment by *Azarias* the high Prieſt, and whether his ſonne during

ring his life were truly King, or only regent or Gouernour vnder his Father, or whether he were bound to consult with his said Father in his greateſt affaires, & take his approbation and commiſsion, that point, which is moſt important, *Doctor Barkley* proueth not, but only that *Ozias* notwithſtanding his ſeparation was called King during his life, which letted not, but that his ſonne might be truly King alſo, during his Fathers dayes: for otherwiſe *D. Barkley* might aſwell ſay, that his Maieſty now of England (for example) was not King of Scotland, whiles his Mother the Queene liued in her exile, which yet I thinke he will not ſay; and therfore to vſe the wordes *impudentia, nequitia*, and *falſiſſimum* in a matter ſo doubtfull, might perhaps haue byn omitted; but much more ought to haue byn the multiplicity of falſities vſed by T. M. in relating the ſame, & namely in bringing in *Cardinall Bellarmine* with ſuch ardent deſire to haue him contradicted & diſgraced, as he not only applieth to him that which was ſpokē againſt another, but reciting alſo two lines of his ſpeech, beſides other manglinges, ſhufleth in falſly two or three words, that ouerthrow the whole controuerſy, to wit *ſeparatus extra Regnum*, that King *Ozias* was ſeparated by *Azarias* the Prieſt forth of the Kingdome: wheras *Bellarmine* hath not theſe wordes *extra Regnum* at al, but only that he was ſeparated from the Citty *extra vrbem in domo ſolitaria* forth of the Citty in a ſolitary houſe, which thing the Scripture it ſelf before related doth teſtify; wherby yow ſee what botching there is to bring matters to his purpoſe; and yet will he needs ſtile himſelf *The Miniſter of ſimple truth.*

Ozias how he vvas ſeparated by the high Prieſt.

12. It followeth in the 16. page thus: *Your deuiſe* (ſaith he) *of exemption of Prieſtes* (from the iuriſdiction of temporall Princes in certaine caſes) *is to crude to be diſgeſted by any reaſonable Deuine, for* (*as your* Victoria *ſaith*) *Prieſtes, beſides that they are Miniſters of the Church, they are likewiſe members*

The third example pag. 16.

members of the Common-wealth, and a King is aſwell a King of the Clergy, as of the laity, therfore the Clergy is ſubiect vnto the ciuill authority in temporall thinges, for ſuch matter is not ruled by any power ſpirituall: A plaine demonſtration. So he. And I ſay the ſame, that indeed it is a plaine demonſtration of his egregious falſhood, and abuſing his Reader. Firſt in making him belieue, that the learned man *Franciſcus de Victoria* doth fauour him or his in this matter of the exemption of Prieſtes, wheras in this very place heere cited by T. M. his firſt propoſition of all in this matter is this: *Eccleſiaſtici iure ſunt exempti &c. I doe affirme that Eccleſiaſticall men are by Law exempted, and freed from ciuill power, ſo as they may not be conuented before a ſecular Iudge, either in criminall or ciuill cauſes, & the contrary doctrine to this is condemned for Hereticall, among the articles of Iohn VVickliffe in the Councell of Conſtance.* So he. And now ſee whether *Victoria* make for him or no, or whether he diſgeſted well this *crude doctrine* of Prieſtes exemption, as this Miniſters phraſe is.

Franc. de Victoria relect. 1. de poteſt. Eccleſiæ Sect. 4.

13. Secondly if we conſider, either the Engliſh tranſlation heere ſet downe out of the wordes of *Victoria*, or his Latin text, for oſtentation ſake put in the margent, wee ſhall find ſo many and monſtrous foule corruptions, interciſions, geldinges and mutilations, as is a ſhame to behold; and I beſeech the learned Reader to haue patience to conferre but this one place only with the Author, and he will reſt inſtructed in the más ſpirit for the reſt: but he muſt find them as I háue cited them heere in the margent, and not as T. M. erroneouſly quoteth them, if not of purpoſe to eſcape the examine. For that *Victoria* hauing ſet downe his precedent generall propoſition, for the exemption of Clergy men, that they were exempted *Iure* by Law, he paſſeth on to examine in his ſecond propoſition *Quo iure*, by what Law, diuine or humane they are exempted; and in his third, he holdeth that *Aliqua exemptio*

Variety of corruptiõs

Victoria his propoſitions about exẽption of Clergy men, and T. M his corruptiõs therin.

exemptio Clericorum est de iure Diuino: That some kinde of exemptions of Clergy men from ciuill power, is by diuine Law, and not humane only, and fourthly he commeth to this which heere is set downe by T. M. but not as he setteth it downe. *Our fourth proposition* (saith *Victoria*) *is, that the persons of Clergy men are not absolutly, and in all thinges exempted from ciuill power either by diuine or humane lawe; which is euident by that Clergy men are bound to obey the temporall lawes of the Citty, or Cōmon-wealth wherin they liue, in those thinges that doe appertaine to the temporall gouernment, and administration therof, and doe not let or hinder Ecclesiasticall gouernment.*

14. These are the wordes of *Victoria* as they ly togeather in him, and then after some argumentes interposed, for his said conclusion, he addeth also this proofe: That for so much as Clergy mē besides this, that they » are Ministers of the Church, are Citizens also of the » Common-wealth, they are bound to obey the tempo- » rall lawes of that Common-wealth or Prince in tem- » porall affaires; and then ensueth the last reason (heere » set downe in English by T.M.) in these wordes: *More-* » *ouer* (saith *Victoria*) *for that a King is King not only of laymen, but of Clergy-men also, therfore* aliquo modo subiiciuntur ei, *in some sort they are subiect vnto him:* Which wordes *aliquo modo* in some sorte, the Minister leaueth out; and then it followeth immediatly in *Victoria: And for that Clergy-men are not gouerned in temporall matters by Ecclesiasticall power, therfore they haue their temporall Prince, vnto whome they are bound to yeeld obedience in temporall affaires.*

15. And this is all that *Victoria* hath in this matter, & in these very wordes. And let any man consider the patching, which T. M. vseth both in English and Latin in this place, to make some shew for his fained demonstration out of *Victoria*, and he will see how poore and miserable a man he is, and how miserable a cause he defendeth. And in particular, let the very last pro-

poſition be noted which he citeth, and Engliſheth as out of *Victoria*, to wit, *the Clergy is ſubiect vnto the ciuill authority in temporall thinges, for ſuch matter is not ruled by any power ſpirituall*, wherby he would haue his Reader to imagine, that no ſpirituall power may haue authority to gouerne temporall matters; wheras the wordes of *Victoria* are: *Clerici quantum ad temporalia non adminiſtrantur poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica, that Clergy men, for ſo much as appertaineth to temporall affaires, are not gouerned by Eccleſiaſticall power, but by the temporall which there beareth rule*: So as this fellow by a ſubtile ſleight changing the nominatiue caſe from *Clerici non adminiſtrantur* to *temporalia non adminiſtrantur*, frameth his plaine demonſtration out of plaine coſenage and forgery. And *is this naked innocency?*

Changing of nominatiue caſes.

16. From the page 18. vnto 27. he handleth togeather many ſentences and authorities of ancient Fathers, alledged by Catholicke Authors *Cunerus*, *Toloſanus*, and eſpecially *Barkleius*, to ſhew that the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſours, and thoſe Fathers amongeſt the reſt, did not take armes againſt their Princes either Infidels or Chriſtians, but did rather ſuffer iniuries, then ſeeke by force to reuenge the ſame; which being our concluſion in like manner, and held and defended by our Catholicke writers as yow ſee, and that for the moſt part, by name againſt Proteſtant writers & practiſers, both in *Scotland*, *France*, *Flanders*, & other places, yow may perceaue how corruptly this is brought in againſt vs, as though our common beliefe and exerciſe were the contrary, & this may be called falſification and ſophiſtication of our meaning.

The 4. example pag. 18. 19. 20.

Fraudes vſed out of the ancient Fathers and Cath. vvriters.

17. But yet if we would examine the particular authorities that be alledged about this matter, though nothing making againſt vs as hath byn ſaid, & conſider how many falſe ſhiftes are vſed by T. M. therin; yow would ſay he were a Doctor in deed in that ſcience, for that a ſeuerall Treatiſe will ſcarce con-

reine

teine them. I will touch only two for examples sake. He citeth *Doctor Barkley*, bringing in the authority of *S. Ambrose*, that he resisted not by force his *Arrian* Emperour, when he would take a Church from him for the Arrians, but he setteth not downe what answere of his *Doctor Barkley* doth alledge in the very self same place, which is: *Allegatur Imperatori licere omnia &c.* It is alledged that it is lawfull for the Emperour to doe all thinges, for that all thinges are his (*and consequently that he may assigne a Church to the Arrians:*) Wherto I answere saith *S. Ambrose*; trouble not your selfe O Emperour, nor thinke that yow haue Imperiall right ouer those thinges that are diuine; doe not exalt your selfe, but if yow wil raigne long, be subiect to God, for it is written that those thinges that belong to God must be giuen to God, and to Cesar only those thinges that belõg to Cesar; Pallaces appertaine to the Emperour, but Churches to the Priest, the right of defending publicke walles is committed to yow, but not of sacred thinges. Thus *Doctor Barkley* out of *S. Ambrose* in the very place cited by T. M. which he thought good wholy to pretermit, and cut of, as not making for his purpose; and so had he done more wisely, if he had left out also the other authority of Pope *Leo*, which he reciteth in the eight place of authorities, out of ancient Fathers in these wordes.

pag. 24. *Barkleus l. 3. cap. 5.* " " " " " " " " *Ambros. l. 5 Ep. 33.* " A cleere authority of S. Ambrose imbezeled by T. M.

18. The eighth Father (saith he) is Pope *Leo*, writing to a true Catholicke Emperour, saying: *Yow may not be ignorant that your Princely power is giuen vnto yow, not only in worldly regiment, but also spirituall, for the preseruation of the Church: as if he said not only in cases temporall but also in spirituall, so far as it belongeth to the outward preseruation, not to the personall administration of them, and this is the substance of our English oath: And further neither doe our Kinges of England chalenge, nor subiectes condescend vnto.* In which wordes yow see two thinges are conteined, first

The fifth example. Pag. 26.

what authority *S. Leo* the Pope aboue eleuen hundred yeares gone aſcribed vnto *Leo* the Emperour in matters ſpirituall and Eccleſiaſticall. The ſecond, by this mans aſſertion, that neither our Kinges of England chaleng, nor doe the ſubiectes condeſcend vnto any more in the oath of the *Supremacy* that is propoſed vnto them; which if it be ſo, I ſee no cauſe why all Engliſh Catholickes may not take the ſame in like manner, ſo far forth as *S. Leo* alloweth ſpiritual authority to the Emperour of his time. Wherfore it behoueth that the Reader ſtand attent to the deciding of this queſtion, for if this be true which heere he ſaith, our controuerſy about the *Supremacy* is at an end.

19. Firſt then about the former point, let vs conſider how many waies T. M. hath corrupted the foreſaid authority of *S. Leo*, partly by fraudulent allegation in Latin, and partly by falſe tranſlation into Engliſh. For that in Latin it goeth thus, as himſelf putteth it downe in the margent: *Debes incunctanter aduertere, Regiam poteſtatem non ſolùm ad mundi regimen, ſed maximè ad Eccleſiæ præſidium eſſe collatam.* Yow ought (ô Emperour) reſolutly to conſider, that your Kingly power is not only giuen vnto yow for gouernment of the world, or worldly affaires, but eſpecially for defence of the Church: and then doe enſue immediatly theſe other wordes alſo in *S. Leo*, ſuppreſſed fraudulently by the Miniſter, for that they explicate the meaning of the Author: *Vt auſus nefarios comprimendo, & quæ bene ſunt ſtatuta defendas, & veram pacem his quæ ſunt turbata reſtituas:* To the end that yow may by repreſsing audacious attemptes both defend thoſe thinges that are well ordeined and decreed, (*as namely in the late generall Councell of Calcedon*) and reſtore peace where matters are troubled, *as in the Citty and Sea of Alexandria*, where the Patriarch *Proterius* being ſlaine and murdered by the conſpiracy of the *Dioſcorian* Heretickes, lately condemned in the

Many falshoods.

Leo ep. 75. ad Leonẽ Auguſtũ.

in the said Councell, all thinges are in most violent garboiles, which require your imperiall power to remedy, compose, and compresse the same.

20. This is the true meaning of *S. Leo* his speech to the good and Religious Emperour of the same name, as appeareth throughout the whole Epistle heere cited and diuers others. *Nonne perspicuum est* (saith he) *quibus pietas vestra succurrere, & quibus obuiare, ne Alexandrina Ecclesia &c.* Is it not euident whome your Imperiall piety ought to assist and succour, and whome yow ought to resist and represse, to the end the Church of *Alexandria*, that hitherto hath byn the house of praier, become not a den of theeues? Surely it is most manifest that by this late barbarous and most furious cruelty (in murdering that Patriarch) all the light of heauenly Sacramentes is there extinguished; *Intercepta est Sacrificij oblatio, defecit chrismatis sanctificatio &c.* The oblation of sacrifice is intermitted, the hallowing of Chrisme is ceassed, and all diuine misteries of our Religion haue withdrawne themselues from those parricidiall handes of those Heretickes, that haue murdered their owne Father and Patriarch *Proterius*, burned his body, and cast the ashes into the ayer. *Ibid.c.5.*

The Christian sacrifice ceased in Alexãdria.

21. This then was the cause and occasion wherin the holy Pope *Leo* did implore the helpe and secular arme of *Leo* the Emperour, for chastising those turbulent Heretiks, to which effect he saith that his Kingly power was not only giuen him for the gouernmẽt of the world, but also for the defence of the Church, which our Minister doth absurdly translate *not only in worldly regiment, but also spirituall for the preseruation of the Church*, turning *ad* into *in*, and *præsidium* into *preseruation*; and then maketh the commentary which before we haue set downe: *As if he had said* (quoth he) *not only in causes temporall, but also in spirituall, so far as it belongeth to outward preseruation, not to the personall administratiõ of them.*

Notable corruptiõ of S. Leo his meaning.

22. And heere now he sheweth himself intangled, not only about the assertion of Imperiall power in spirituall matters, by that *S. Leo* saith it is giuen *ad præsidium Ecclesiæ*, to the defence of the Church, which proueth nothing at all for him, but against him rather as yow see, and much more in the explication therof, to wit, what is meant by this authority, & how farre it strecheth it self: wherin truly I neuer found Protestant yet that could cleerly set downe the same, so as he could make it a distinct doctrine from ours, and giue it that limites which his fellowes would agree vnto, or themselues make probable.

About Ecclesiastical supremacy in temporall Princes.

23. About which matter *M. Morton* heere as yow see (who seemeth no small man amongest them, and his booke must be presumed to haue come forth with the approbation and allowance of his Lord and Maister the Archbishop at least) saith as yow haue heard, that it is no more, but such as *S. Leo* allowed in the Emperour *ad Ecclesiæ præsidium* to the defence of the Church, and Church matters and men, and for punishing Heretickes that troubled the same. And further more T. M. expoundeth the matter saying: *That this Imperiall & Kingly authority in spirituall causes reacheth no further, but as it belongeth to outward preseruation, not to the personall administration of them.* And doe not we graunt also the same? Or doe not we teach that temporall Princes power ought principally, as *S. Leo* saith, to extend it self to the defence ad preseruation of the Church? In this then we agree and haue no difference.

Pag. 26.

24. There followeth in T. M. his assertion heere: *But not in the personall administration of them* (to wit of spirituall causes, & this now is a shift dissembling the difficulty, and true State of the question) *which is in whome consisteth the supreame power, to treate, iudge, and determine in spirituall causes*; which this man flying, as not able to resolue, telleth vs only, that he cannot perso-

T. M. his coceipt of the oath of Supremacy in England.

nally

nally administer the same; which yet I would aske him why? For as a Bishop may personally performe all the actions, that he hath giuen authority to inferiour Priestes to doe in their functions, and a temporall Prince may execute in his owne person, if he list, any inferiour authority that he hath giuen to others in temporall affaires; so, if he haue supreame authority spirituall also, why may he not in like manner execute the same by himself, if he please? But of this is sufficiently writtē of late in the foresaid booke of Answere to *Syr Edward Cooke*, where also is shewed, that a farre greater authority spirituall was giuen to King *Henry* the eight by Parlament, then this that T. M. alloweth his Maiesty now for outward preseruation of the Church, to wit *To be head therof, in as ample manner, as euer the Pope was, or could be held before him, ouer England*: and to King *Edward*, though then but of ten yeares old was granted also by Parlament, *That he had originally in himself by his Crowne and Scepter all Episcopall authority; so as the Bishops and Archbishops had no other power, or spirituall authority then was deriued from him*: & to Queene *Elizabeth* by like graunt of Parlament, was also giuen *as great authority spirituall and Ecclesiasticall ouer the Church and Clergy of England, as euer any person had, or could exercise before*, which was and is another thing then this outward preseruation which T. M. now assigneth, hauing pared the same in minced wordes to his purpose, to make it seeme little or nothing, but dareth not stand to it, if he be called to the triall.

Answere to Syr Edward Cooke c. 2. & 3.

Statut. an. 26 Hen. 8. cap. 1. ann. Christi 1535.

Statut. 1. Edouardi 6. c. 6. anno 1547.

Stat. 1. Eliza. an. 1559.

25. Wherfore this matter being of so great importance and consequence as yow see, I doe heere take hold of this his publicke assertion, and require that it may be made good, to wit, that this is the substance & meaning only of the English oath, and *that neither our Kinges of England doe chalenge more, nor subiectes required to condescend to more then to grant to their authority for outward preser-*

Hold take on the offer of T.M. about the oath of Supremacy.

preseruation, or *ad Ecclesiæ præsidium*, as *S. Leo* his wordes and meaning are, and I dare assure him, that al Catholickes in England will presently take the oath, and so for this point there will be an attonement. Me thinkes that such publicke doctrine should not be so publickly printed, and set forth, without publicke allowance and intention to performe and make it good. Yf this be really meant, we may easely be accorded; if not then will the Reader see, what credit may be giuen to any thing they publish; notwithstanding this booke commeth forth with this speciall commendation of *Published by authority &c.*

S. Leo Papa ep. 34. 46. 62. 81. 87. Serm. 1. de nata. Apostolorum Petri & Pauli.

26. And for conclusion of all, it may be noted that there hath byn not only lacke of truth and fidelity in citing Pope *Leo* for Ecclesiasticall Supremacy in Emperours aboue Popes, but want of modesty & discretion also; for so much as no one ancient Father doth more often and earnestly inculcate the contrary, for the preheminence of the Sea of *Rome*, then doth *S. Leo*; in so much that *Iohn Caluin*, not being able otherwise to answere him, saith, *that he was toote desirous of glory & dominion*, and so shifteth him of that way; and therfore he was no fit instance for T. M. to bring heere in proofe of spirituall supremacy in temporall Princes.

Calvin. l. 4. instit. c. 7. §. 11.

27. But yet in the very next page after, he vseth a far greater immodesty, or rather perfidy in my opiniõ in calumniation of *Cardinall Bellarmine*, whome he abuseth notably both in allegation, exposition, translation, application, and vaine insultation; for thus he citeth in his text out of him. Ancient generall Councelles (saith the Romish pretence) were not gathered „ without the cost of good and Christian Emperours, „ and were made by their consentes, for in those dayes „ the Popes did make supplication to the Emperour, „ that by his authority he would gather Synods, but af- „ ter those times all causes were changed, because the

The fixt example of Cardinall Bellarmine.

Pope

Pope who is head in ſpirituall matters cannot be ſubiect in temporall. *Bellarm. lib.* 1. *de Concil. cap.* 13. §. Habemus ergo. »

28. And hauing alledged this reſolutiõ of *Bellarmine*, the Miniſter inſulteth ouer him in theſe words: Who would thinke this man could be a Papiſt, much leſſe a Ieſuit, how much leſſe a Cardinal, who thus diſableth the title of the Pope, granting to vs in theſe wordes: *after theſe times* (that is after ſix hundred yeares) *the truth of purer antiquities challenging Popes to be ſubiect vnto Chriſtian Emperours*? And yet who but a Papiſt would (as it were in deſpite of antiquity) defend the degenerate ſtate, ſaying, *after thoſe times Popes might not be ſubiect in temporall matters?* As if he ſhould haue ſaid: Then gratious fauour of ancient Chriſtian Emperours, then ſound iudgment of ancient reuerend Fathers, then deuout ſubiection of ancient holy Popes; in ſumme then ancient purity and pure antiquity adieu. But we may not ſo baſtardly reiect the *depoſitum* and doctrine of humble ſubiection, which we haue receaued from our Fathers of the firſt ſix hundred yeares; and not ſo only, but which (as your *Barkley* witneſſeth) the vniuerſall Chriſtian world imbraced, with common conſent for a full thouſand yeares. So he. »

A childish inſultatiõ of T. M. ouer Cardinall Bellarmine.

29. And doe yow ſee how this Miniſter triumpheth? Who would thinke that men of conſcience or credit could make ſuch oſtentation vpon meere lies deuiſed by themſelues, as now wee ſhall ſhew all this bragge to be? And as for *D. Barkley* alledged in the laſt lines, let any man read him in the booke and Chapter cited, and he will wonder at the impudency of this vaunter; for he ſpeaketh no one word of gathering Councells, or compariſon of ſpirituall authority betweene the Pope and Emperour, concerning their gathering of Councelles or Synodes; but of a quite different ſubiect, of taking armes by ſubiectes againſt their lawfull

Barkleius l. 6. aduers. Monarch. c. 26

temporall Princes. And what will our Miniſter then anſwere to this manifeſt calumniation ſo apparently conuinced out of *Doctor Barkley*? But let vs paſſe to the view of that which toucheth Cardinall *Bellarmine*, againſt whome all this tempeſt is raiſed.

30. Firſt then we ſhall ſet downe his wordes in Latin according as T.M. citeth him in his margent. *Tunc Concilia generalia fiebant* (ſaith he) *non ſine Imperatorum ſumptibus, & eo tempore Pontifex ſubiiciebat ſe Imperatoribus in temporalibus, & ideo non poterant inuito Imperatore aliquid agere: idcirco Pontifex ſupplicabat Imperatori vt iuberet conuocari Synodum. At poſt illa tempora, omnes cauſæ mutatæ ſunt, quia Pontifex qui eſt caput in ſpiritualibus, non eſt ſubiectus in temporalibus.* Then in thoſe dayes generall Councelles were made not without the charges of Emperours, & in that time the Pope did ſubiect himſelfe vnto Emperours in temporall affaires, and therfore they could doe nothing againſt the Emperours will, for which cauſe the Pope did make ſupplication to the Emperour, that he would commaund Synodes to be gathered; but after thoſe times all cauſes were changed, for that the Pope who is head in ſpirituall matters, is not ſubiect in temporall affaires. So he.

Bellar. l. 1. de Conciliis ca. 13. §. habemus ergo.

31. And heere let vs conſider the variety of ſleightes & ſhifts of this our Miniſter, not only in citing *Bellarmins* wordes falſly, and againſt his meaning and drift in Latin, wherof we ſhall ſpeake preſently; but in peruerting this Latin that he hath ſo corruptly ſet downe in his former Engliſh tranſlation. For firſt hauing ſaid according to the Latin, that generall Councelles in thoſe dayes were not gathered without the coſt of Emperours, he addeth preſently of his owne, *and were made by their conſentes*, which is not in the Latin: and then he cutteth of the other wordes immediatly enſuing, which conteine the cauſe; to wit for
» that the Popes ſubiecting themſelues in thoſe dayes

Diuers ſortes of corruptiō.

touching

touching temporalities vnto the Emperours (as *hauing no temporall States or dominion yet of their owne*) could doe nothing without them, and therfore did make supplication to the said Emperours that they would commaund Synodes to be gathered: which T. M. translateth *that they would gather Synodes*, as though *Bellarmine* did affirme, that it lay in the Emperours, by right, to doe it: but after those times *omnes causæ mutatæ sunt*, all causes were changed, but he should haue said, *are changed*, as *Bellarmins* true wordes are, *omnes istæ causæ*, al these causes are chãged, to wit foure sortes of causes, which he setteth downe, why generall Councells could not be well gathered in those dayes without the Emperours help and authority, which wordes are guilefully cut of by this deceauer, as in like manner the last wordes put downe heere by himselfe, *Pontifex non est subiectus in temporalibus*, are falsly translated, *cannot be subiect in temporall*, and againe afterward, *Popes might not be subiect in temporall matters*, which is to make *Bellarmine* contrary to himselfe, who saith a little before that the Popes did subiect themselues for many years, wherby is proued, that they could doe it; but *Bellarmins* meaning is that in right by the preheminence of their spirituall dignity, they were exempted, & not bound therunto.

32. And thus much now for the corruptions vsed in the wordes heere set downe both in Latin & English. But if we would goe to *Bellarmine* himself and see his whole discourse, and how brokenly and perfidiously these lines are cut out of him, and heere patched togeather as one entier context contrary to his drift and meaning, we shall meruaile more at the insolency of *Thomas Morton*, triumphing ouer his owne *lye*, as before hath byn said; for that *Bellarmine* hauing proued at larg, and by many sortes of argumentes and demonstrations, throughout diuers Chapters togeather, that the right of gathering generall Councelles

The sũme of Cardinall Bellarmines discourse falsified by T. M.

belongeth only to the Bishop of *Rome*, and hauing answered all obiections that could be made against the same in the behalfe of Emperours, or other temporall Princes, grãting only that for certaine causes in those first ages, the same could not be done (in respect of temporall difficulties) without the helpe & assistance of the said Emperours, that were Lords of the world; he commeth to make this conclusion which heere is cited by T. M. but in far other wordes and meaning then heere he is cited. Yow shall heare how he setteth it downe, & therupõ consider of the truth of this Minister. *Habemus ergo* (saith he) *prima illa Concilia &c.* We haue then by all this disputation seene, how those first Christian Councelles were commaunded by Empe-rours to be gathered, but by the sentence and consent of Popes, and why the Pope alone in those dayes did not call Councelles, as afterward hath byn accustomed; the reason was, not for that Councelles gathered without the Emperours consent are not lawfull, as our Aduersaries would haue it, for against that is the expresse authority of *S. Athanasius* saying: *Quando vnquam iudicium Ecclesiæ ab Imperatore authoritatem habuit?* When was it euer seene that the iudgment of the Church did take authority from the Emperour? but for many other most iust causes was the Emperours consent required therin &c. So *Bellarmine*.

Bellar. l. de Concil. cap 13. §. Habemus ergo.

Athan. in ep. ad solitar. vitam agentes.

33. And heere now yow see, that *Bellarmins* drift is wholy against *M. Mortons* assertion: for that he denieth that euer the Emperours had any spirituall authority for calling of Councells; but only that they could not well in those dayes be made without them, and that for foure seuerall causes; wherof the first was, for that the old Imperiall lawes made by Gentils were yet in vse, wherby all great meetinges of people were forbidden, for feare of sedition, except by the Emperours knowledge & licence: the second for that Emperours being

Fovver causes vvhy Emperours consents vvere necessary for gathering of Councells in olde time.

1.

Cap. 6. 2.

being temporall Lordes of the whole world, the Councells could be made in no Citty of theirs without their leaue: the thirtd for that generall Councelles being made in thoſe dayes, by the publicke charges & contributions of Citties, and eſpecially of Chriſtian Emperours themſelues, as appeareth by *Euſebius*, *Theodoretus*, & other writers, it was neceſſary to haue their conſent and approbation in ſo publicke an action, as that was.

See ff. de Coll. ill. & l. conuent. de Epiſc. & Presbyteris.

3. *Euſeb. l. 3. de vita Conſtant. Theodor. l. 1. Hiſtor. cap. 16.*

34. The fourth and laſt cauſe was (ſaith *Bellarmine*) for that in thoſe dayes, albeit the Biſhop of Rome where head in ſpirituall matters ouer the Emperours themſelues; yet in temporall affaires he did ſubiect himſelf vnto them, as hauing no temporal State of his owne, and therfore acknowledging them to be his temporall Lords, he did make ſupplicatiõ vnto them to commaund Synodes to be gathered by their authority and licence: *At poſt illa tempora iſta omnes cauſæ mutatæ ſunt*; but ſince thoſe dayes all theſe foure cauſes are changed. *& ipſe in ſuis Prouinciis eſt Princeps Supremus temporalis, ſicut ſunt Reges & Principes alij*; and the Pope himſelf now in his temporall Prouinces is ſupreme temporall Lord alſo, as other Kings & Princes are, which was brought to paſſe by Godes prouidence (ſaith *Bellarmine*) to the end that he might with more freedome, liberty, and reputation exerciſe his office of generall Paſtorſhip.

4.

35. And this is all that *Bellarmine* hath of this matter. And now may we cõſider the vanity of this Mortons triumph ouer him before, and how falſly he dealeth with him, alledging him againſt his owne drift and meaning, leauing out alſo thoſe foure cauſes by me recited, and then cutting of fraudulently the particle *iſtæ*, theſe cauſes are now changed, which includeth reference to theſe foure, aid furthermore ſpeaking indefinitely, as though all cauſes and matters were

now changed, seeketh therby to deceaue his Reader, and to extort from *Bellarmine*, that confession of antiquity on his side which he neuer meant, and much lesse vttered in his writings. What dealing, what conscience, what truth is this?

36. In the very next page after he talking of the great and famous contention that passed betweene Pope *Gregory* the seauenth called *Hildebrand*, and *Henry* the fourth Emperour of that name, about the yeare 1070. he citeth the Historiographer *Otto Frisingensis*, with this ordinary title of our *Otto*, for that he writeth, that he found not any Emperour actually excommunicated or depriued of his Kingdome by any Pope before that time, except (saith he) that may be esteemed for an excommunication which was done to *Philippe* the Emperour by the Bishop of Rome, almost 1400. years gone, when for a short time, he was *Inter pœnitentes collocatus*, placed by the said Pope among those that did pennance, as that also of the Emperour *Theodosius*, who was sequestred from entring into the Church by *S. Ambrose*, for that he had commanded a certaine cruell slaughter to be committed in the Citty of *Thessalonica*: both which exceptions this Minister of *simple truth* leaueth out of purpose, which is no simplicity as yow see, but yet no great matter with him, in respect of the other that ensueth, which is, that he alledgeth this *Frisingensis* quite contrary to his owne meaning, as though he had condemned *Pope Gregory* the seauenth for it, wheras he condemneth that cause of the Emperour, and commendeth highly the Pope for his constancy in punishing the notorious intolerable faultes of the said *Henry*. *Hildebrandus* (saith he) *semper in Ecclesiastico rigore constantissimus fuit*: Hildebrand was euer the most constant in defendng the rigour of Eccleiastical discipline. And again: in this very Chapter heere alledged by T. M. *Inter omnes Sacerdotes & Romanos Pontifices*

The 7. exãple out of Otho Frisingensis.

Frisin. l. 6. hist. c. 32.

Otho Frisingensis abused.

Ibid. l. 6. c. 36.

tifices præcipui zeli & authoritatis fuit: he was among all the Prieſtes and Pops that had byn of the Roman Sea of moſt principall zeale and authority. How different is this iudgment of *Friſingenſis* from the cenſure of T. M. who now after fiue hundred yeares paſt, compareth the cauſe of Pope *Gregory*, to that of Pyrates, theeues, and murtherers, and ſo citeth our *Otto Friſingenſis* as though he had fauored him in this impious aſſertion. Can any thing be more fraudently alledged? Is this *the aſſurance of his vpright conſcience*, wherof he braggeth to his Maieſty?

37. But the next fraud or impudency or rather impudent impiety is that which enſueth within foure lines after in theſe words: *Pope Gregory the ſeauenth (ſaith your Chronographer) was excommunicate of the Bishops of Italy, for that he had defamed the Apoſtolicke Sea by Symony, and other capitall crimes*, & then citeth for proofe herof *Lambertus Schafnaburg. anno* 1077. As if this our Chronographer had related this as a thing of truth, or that it were approued by him, and not rather as a ſlanderous obiection caſt out by his Aduerſaries that followed the part of *Henry* the Emperour. Let any man read the place, and yeare heere cited, and if he be a modeſt man, he will bluſh at ſuch ſhameles dealing. For that no Author of that time doth more earneſtly defend the cauſe & vertuous life of *Pope Hildebrand*, then this man, whoſe wordes are: *Sed apud omnes ſanum aliquid ſapientes luce clarius conſtabat falſa eſſe quæ dicebãtur: Nam & Papa tam eximiè tamq; Apoſtolicè vitam inſtituebat &c.* But with all men of ſound wiſedome it was more cleere then the ſunne, that the thinges which were ſpoken againſt Pope *Hildebrand* were falſe, for that the Pope did lead ſuch an excellent and Apoſtolicke life, as the ſublimity of his conuerſation did admit no leaſt ſpot of wicked rumour againſt him, he liuing in that great Citty and open concourſe of men, it could not haue byn hidden,

The 8. example of Lamb. Scafnaburgenſis.

Lambert. Schafnabur. in hiſtor. Germaniæ an. 1077. ſub finem.

» hidden, if he had committed any vnlawfull thing in
» his life: and moreouer the signes and miracles, which
» by his prayers were often times done, and his most fer-
» uent zeale for God in defence of Ecclesiasticall lawes,
» did sufficiently defend him against the poisoned ton-
» gues of his detractours. And againe: *Hildebrandi constantia, & inuictus aduersus auaritiam animus omnia excludebat argumenta humana fallacia*: the constancy of Pope *Hildebrand*, and his inuincible minde against the corruption of auarice, did exclude all argumentes of humane fallacy and deceipt. So *Lambertus*.

38. And now let the Reader consider with what conscience and fidelity T. M. hath cited him for condemnation of Pope *Hildebrand*. He relateth indeed, what certaine Noble men, Captaines and others, that came with the Emperour to the Castell of *Canusium*, and would not haue had him made peace with the Pope in that place, said in their rage afterwardes, for that against their Counsell he had submitted himself vnto the said Pope, & when a certaine Bishop named *Eppo*, was sent to their Campe by the Pope, and Emperour to enforme them of the agreement and submission made: *Fremere omnes* (saith this Story) *& sæuire verbis, & manibus caperunt, Apostolicæ legationi irrisoriis exclamationibus obstrepere, conuitia & maledicta turpissima quæcunque furor suggessisset irrogare*. All of them began to fret and wax fierce, both in wordes and casting their handes, and with scornefull outcries to contradict this Apostolicall legation sent vnto them, and to cast vpon the Pope al the most foule reproaches and maledictions that fury could suggest vnto them. Thus saith *Lambertus*: and then setteth downe the particuler slanderous reproaches heere cited by T. M. which he approueth not, but condemneth as yow haue heard, & highly commendeth not only the vertue but sanctity also of the Pope. And will euer any man credit T. M. any

The submission of the Emperour Henry the fourth to Pope Hildebrand at *Canusiū*.

Lambertus vbi supra.

T. M. any more in any thing that he alledgeth, when this conſcienceles falſification is once diſcouered in him? yea though it were but once throughout his whole booke, it were ſufficient to proue that he dealeth not out of any faith or conſcience at all.

39. If an enemy would diſcredit both Chriſt and Chriſtian Religion, and ſay your owne Euangeliſtes doe recount foule thinges againſt him (as heere this Miniſter ſaith our Hiſtoriographer doth of Pope Gregory) and namely that he was accuſed by the Scribes and Phariſies for caſting out diuells in the power of Belzebub; for deceiuing the people; for denying tribute of the paid to Ceſar; for mouing ſedition, and other like crimes, which our Euangeliſtes doe recount indeed, but doe condemne them alſo as falſe and calumnious; were not this as good and faithfull a manner of reaſoning, as this other of *Thomas Morton* out of *Lambertus* and *Friſingenſis* againſt Pope *Hildebrand*, who is by them both moſt highly commẽded as yow haue heard, and his Aduerſaries condemned? Truly, if any man can ſhew me out of all the Catholicke writers that be extant, Engliſh or other, that euer any one of them vſed this ſhamefull fraud in writing, where no excuſe can free them from malicious and witting falſhood, then will I graunt that it is not proper to the Proteſtant ſpirit alone. Hitherto I muſt confeſſe that I neuer found it in any, and if I ſhould, though it were but once, I ſhould hold it for a ſufficient argument not to beliene him euer after. And this ſhall ſuffice for a taſt only of *M. Mortons* manner of proceeding. For that to proſecute al particulers would require a whole volume, and by theſe few yow may gheſſe at the mans vaine and ſpirit in writing.

A compariſon expreſſing the fraud of T. M.

THE SECOND PART OF THIS CHAPTER,

REPRESENTING

Some of the falsifications vvhich are vttered in the former Part of *M. Mortons* Reply,

VVhich came to our handes after our Answere made before in our second Chapter against his ten Reasons.

AND now albeit these false and fraudulent dealings laid open in the precedent Part of this Chapter, be sufficient or rather superaboundant to descry this Minister and his naked innocency, who in his Epistle to his Maiesty, as before hath byn touched calleth himself *A Minister of simple truth and vpright conscience*; yet for more perfect complement of the same, I haue thought good to adioine also a second Part to this Chapter, and therin to draw to light some number of his notorious vntruthes, corruptions, sleightes, falsifications and calumniations vttered in the former

Part

Part of his *Reply* to the moderate Reader, which Part not comming to my handes vntill I had made the answere which before I haue set downe in the second Chapter of this Treatise against his *Discouery*, I could not conueniently discusse the same particularly therin: but now by that which heere yow shall see produced, you may easily ghesse how worthy a peece of worke it is, and what credit the man deserueth that made it. And albeit the breuity purposed by me in this place, permitteth not the examine of al, or of the greater part; yet *verbum sapienti sat est*, the discreet Reader by a few examples which demonstrate that the writer wanteth remorse of conscience in his asseuerations, will easily see how farre he is to be credited in all his writinges. Wherfore to the examine it self.

41. In the third page of his said *Reply*, he beginning to talke of the nature of heresy, hath these wordes: *VVee may not be ignorant, first that seeing the nature of heresy is such, that it is a vice proper to the minde, it may denominate the subiect whatsoeuer an Heretick, without obstinacy, which is only a peruerse obliquity of the will, and therfore a man may be an Heretick though he be not obstinate*: And for proofe of this false doctrine, he citeth in his margent *Vasquez Iesuita*, whose wordes are: *Malitia huius peccati intellectu, non in voluntate consummatur*, the malice of this sinne of heresy, is perfected or made consummate in the vnderstanding, and not in the will, which our Minister vnderstanding not, and yet desirous, as in his preface to the Kinges Maiesty he insinuateth, to *deuide our tongues, & to make our writers seeme contrary the one to the other*, hath fondly slaundered the learned man *Vasquez* in this place, by making him seeme to be patrone of this his absurd doctrine, *that heresy may be without obstinacy*; whereas *Vasquez* in the very same disputation heere by him cited, expressely doth impugne this doctrine and establisheth the contrary, defining heresy thus: *Hæresis nihil*

The first example of corruptions.

Vasq. disp. 126. *c.*3.

In 1. *tomo.*

About the nature of heresy and pertinacy.

Ibid. ſ. 1. *aliud eſt quàm error in rebus fidei cum pertinacia*, Hereſy is nothing els, but an errour in matters of faith with obſtinacy.

42. Which another learned mā of the ſame ſchoole, by ſomewhat a more ample definition declareth thus: *Hereſy* (ſaith he) *is an errour contrary to the Catholicke faith, wherunto a man that hath profeſſed the ſaid faith in his baptiſme, doth adhere with an obſtinate minde*: Which definitiō he proueth *ex communi mente Doctorum* by the cōmon conſent of ſchoole Doctors. And finally not to ſtand vpon a thing ſo cleere among vs *S. Thomas* for deciſion heerof hath theſe wordes: *De ratione Hæreſis ſunt duo, electio priuatæ diſciplinæ, & pertinacia*: Two thinges are of the eſſence and intrinſecall nature of hereſy, without which Hereſy cannot be, the one the choice or electiō of a particuler doctrine, diſcipline, or opinion, contrary to the doctrine of the vniuerſall Church; the other pertinacy or obſtinacy in defending the ſame, though the party know that it be againſt the doctrine of the Church, without which knowledge and obſtinacy there can be no Hereſy.

Valentia in 2.2. qu. 11. punct. 1 Turrec. 4. ſumma par 2. c. 1. & Doctores omnes 4 d. 13. & D. Tho. 2, 2 art. 2. Vide etiā Clar. 24. q. 3. Can. dixit Apoſtolus, & Can. Qui in Eccleſia.

43. This is our Catholicke doctrine about the nature of Hereſy, to wit, that it cannot be without obſtinacy, which is ſo common and triuiall, as it is now come into an ordinary prouerbe, to ſay: *VVell I may be in errour, but Hereticke I will neuer be, for that I will hold nothing obſtinatly.* And as for the wordes of *Vaſquez*: that the malice of Hereſy is conſummated in the vnderſtanding, and not in the will; if our Miniſter had read the other wordes immediatly going before, he might perhaps haue vnderſtood *Vaſquez* meaning, for they are theſe: *Vt aliquis ſit verè reus Hæreſis &c.* To make a man be truly guilty of Hereſy, it is not neceſſary that he be carried directly in his affection or will againſt the authority of the Church, that is to ſay, it is not needfull that he haue an expreſſe will and purpoſe to diſobey or con-

Obſtinacy neceſſary to hereſy.

Vaſquez his diſcourſe about pertinacy.

or contradict the Church, but it is inough that he doe „
contradict the same *re ipsa*, indeed, knowing that opi- „
nion which he defendeth to be against the authority „
of the said vniuersall Church, albeit he be not indu- „
ced to this belief with a direct will to impugne the „
Church, but either by desire of glory, or other induce- „
ment: so as indeed the malice of this sinne is consum-
mated in the vnderstanding and not in the will.

44. This is the discourse and doctrine of *Vasquez* in this place about the nature and essence of Heresy, wherin he doth not exclude either the vnderstãding, or will, but includeth them both expressely: for that as there must be knowledge, which appertaineth to the minde or vnderstanding, so must there be choise with obstinacy, which belongeth to the will and affection; but his scholastical consideration is, in which of these two powers of our soule this sinne of Heresy receaueth her consummation. For better explication therof, let vs vse this example: If a man should hold or belieue an erroneous proposition contrary to the doctrine of the Catholicke Church, as for example, that there were but one nature in Christ, not knowing it to be against the Catholicke Church, it were false in it self, and an errour in his vnderstanding, but not Heresy, except also by act of his will he should chuse to hold it with resolution and obstinacy, euen after that he knoweth the same to be against the doctrine of the said Church, *for then this knowledge (saith Vasquez) that it is against the Church, maketh it perfect and consummate Heresy*, albeit the matter passe not to a further act of will, to wit. that he chooseth expressely to contradict the authority of the Church therin, which should be a greater sinne, but yet is not necessary, for that the perfect nature of Heresy is consummated, by knowing that it is against the Church; and for that this notice or knowledge belongeth to the vnder-

Hovv heresy is cõsummated in the vnderstãding and not in the vvill.

ſtanding, therfore *Vaſquez* holdeth, that the laſt perfection or conſummation of this ſinne, is in the vnderſtanding, and not in the will, not meaning to exclude therby obſtinacy of the wil (as ignorantly T.M. doth, when he ſaith *wee may not be ignorant*:) but to ſhew in what power of the minde, the laſt perfection & conſummation of this heinous ſinne conſiſteth, to wit, that a man may be a perfect and conſummate Hereticke, by holding obſtinatly any opinion againſt the doctrine of the Church, after wee once know it to be againſt the ſaid Churches doctrine, though we haue not that further malice alſo of expreſſe will, and purpoſe, to contradict therby the ſaid Church, but only we hold the ſame, for that the opinion pleaſeth vs, or is profitable, or honorable to vs, or therby to contradict another, or ſome ſuch like inducement, according to thoſe wordes of *S. Auguſtine* to *Honoratus*: *Hæreticus eſt qui alicuius temporalis commodi, & maximè gloriæ principatuſq; ſui gratia, falſas ac nouas opiniones, vel gignit vel ſequitur*: An Hereticke is he, who in reſpect of ſome temporall commodity, but eſpecially for his owne glory and preheminence, doth beget or follow falſe and new opinions.

Aug. l. de vtil. credend. ad Honor.

Aug. l. 4. contr. Donat. c. 16.

45. The ſame *S. Auguſtine* alſo againſt the Donatiſtes propoſeth this example: *Conſtituamus* (ſaith he) *aliquem ſentire de Chriſto quod Photinus &c.* Let vs imagine one to thinke of Chriſt, as *Photinus* the Hereticke did, perſwading himſelf, that it is the Catholicke faith &c. *iſtum nondũ Hæreticum dico* (ſaith he) *niſi manifeſtata ſibi doctrina Catholicæ fidei reſiſtere maluerit & illud quod tenebat elegerit.* I doe not yet ſay that this man is an Hereticke, vntill after that the doctrine of the Catholicke faith being opened vnto him, he ſhall chooſe notwithſtanding to reſiſt, and to hold by choice, that which before he held by errour. In which wordes *S. Auguſtine* doth euidently declare, how neceſſary both knowledge & will

S. Auguſtines explicatiõ of the vvhole matter.

will are vnto Heresy, and consequently how absurd and ridiculous the assertion of *M. Morton* is, *that Heresy being a vice proper to the vnderstanding, may denominate the subiect whatsoeuer an Heretick, without obstinacy of will.* For albeit we grant with all Deuines, that Heresy is in the vnderstanding as in her subiect (and so is faith also that is her opposite) and further that her last perfection and consummation is from the foresaid knowledge in the vnderstanding, as *Vasquez* doth explane it: yet doth not *Vasquez* or any Deuine els exclude the necessity of pertinacity also, and election in the will, & consequently both his wordes and meaning haue byn euidently falsified, and calumniated by T. M. and so much of this first charge, wherby yow may see what bookes might be made against him, if we would follow his steppes in all his fraudulent traces. But yet let vs see somewhat more in this very leaf and page.

2. Example about true Religion.

46. For within few lines after he beginneth his third Chapter with these wordes: That is only true Religion (say your Romish Doctors) which is taught in the Romish Church, & therfore whosoeuer maintaineth any doctrine cõdemned in that Church, must » be accompted an obstinate Hereticke. And in the » margent he citeth *Cunerus*, alledging his Latin wordes thus: *Hæc est Religionis sola ratio, vt omnes intelligant, sic simpliciter esse credendum atque loquendum, quemadmodum Romana Ecclesia credendum esse docet ac prædicat*: Which wordes if they were truly alledged out of the Author, yet were they not truly translated: for if *by only true Religion* (a corrupt translation of *Religionis sola ratio*) be applied to particuler positions and articles of Religion; then we grant that such true Religion may be also among Hereticks, & not only taught in the Roman Church, for that, as *S. Augustine* well noteth, Heretickes also hold many articles of true Catholicke Religion: but heere the corruption and falsification goeth yet further,

Cuner. de offic. Princip. cap. 13.

S. August. in Psa. 54. in verba Psalm. In multis errant mecum, & *Epist. 48.*

ther,and it is worthy the noting, for that *Cunerus* hauing treated largely againſt the inſurrections and Rebellions of thoſe of *Holland* and *Zeland* for cauſe of Religion,and other pretences againſt their lawfull King, taketh vpon him in his thirteenth Chapter, to lay downe ſome meanes how in his opinion thoſe diſſentions may be compounded,giuing this title to the ſaid Chapter: *Quæ ſit vera componendi diſſidij ratio*, what is the true way of compoſing this diſſention, and then after ſome diſcourſe ſetteth downe this concluſion: *Hæc igitur in Religione concordiæ ſola eſt ratio, vt omnes pio ac ſimplici animo, purè & integrè ſic ſapiant, viuant, loquantur, ac prædicent, quemadmodum ſancta Catholica Romana Eccleſia, quæ Dei prouidentia magiſtra veritatis Orbi præpoſita eſt, docet, loquitur, & prædicat*: This therfore in Religion is the only way of concord,that all men with a pious & ſimple minde, doe wholy and purely conceaue,liue,ſpeake,& preach as the holy Catholicke Roman Church, which God by his prouidence hath giuen for a teacher of truth vnto the whole world,doth teach,ſpeake,and preach.

B. Cunerus egregiouſly peruerted.

47. And now conſider yow this dealing, that whereas *B. Cunerus* ſaith *hæc eſt in Religione cõcordiæ ſola ratio*,this is the only way of concord in Religion, this man alledgeth it in his margent, *hæc eſt Religionis ſola ratio*,this is the only way of Religion,as though *concord* and Religion were al one; & then by another tricke of crafty tranſlation in his Engliſh text *that is only true Religion*, as though true Religion and the way or meanes to come to true Religion were not different; and then for all the reſt how it is mangled,and how many wordes and ſentences are put in by this Miniſter, which are none of *Cunerus*, and how many of his altered,and put out,is eaſy for the Reader to ſee by comparing the two Latin textes before alleadged and therby to conſider how facile a matter it is for this fellow to *deuide our tongues*: *A courſe* (ſaith he) *which I profeſſe in all diſputes*,

In his Epiſtle to the King.

when

when he deuideth and separateth the wordes from their Authors, and the sense from the wordes, and the whole drift from them both: a very fine course, and fit for a man of his profession. But let vs proceed.

48. In the very next page, he going about to make vs odious by our seuere censuring of Heretickes, putteth downe first these wordes of *Alphonsus de Castro: He that vnderstanding any opinion to be expressely condemned by the Church, shall hold the same, is to be accompted an obstinate Heretick*: Wherupon M. *Morton* playeth his pageant thus: *VVhat obstinate? It may be, some doe but doubtingly defend it, what will yow iudge of these?* wherunto he answereth out of *Azor*: *If he doubt therof willingly he is certainly an Heretick*: But by our Ministers leaue *Azor* addeth more; *Quoties quis voluntariè & pertinaciter de fide dubitat eò ipso est hæreticus*, as often as a man doth doubt willingly and obstinatly of his faith he is therby an Heretickè, for that faith is a sure and certaine assert of minde vnto those thinges that are to be belieued; and he that willingly & obstinatly doubteth of the truth therof, cannot haue this firme and perfect assent, & consequently hath no faith during the time of this wilfull & obstinate doubting. And that yow may vnderstand of what importance this word *pertinaciter* is, that this man cunningly so cutteth out of *Azor* his words, yow must know that he in the very same Chapter holdeth, that if a man doubt without pertinacity, being ready to submit his iudgment when he shalbe instructed in the truth, incurreth not Heresy at all. So as heere the most substantiall word is left out, & craftily conueyed away by our deuider of tongues, wherby the Author is made to say the quite opposite to that he saith and protesteth.

3. example pag. 4.

De iusta pun. Hær. l. 1. c. 10.

Azor corrupted.

49. It followeth presently in the same text of T. M. continuing his pleasant vaine of playing with vs: *But it may be* (saith he) *that he which doubteth is ignorant; will no*

4. example

ignorance excuſe him? wherunto he frameth of himſelf this anſwere citing *Tolet* in the margent, *affected ignorance doth argue him an obſtinate Heretick*: Which if yow marke, doth not anſwere the demaund, for he demandeth whether no ignorance at all doth excuſe him, & he anſwereth *that affected ignorance doth not excuſe him, but doth rather argue him an Heretike.* Now thoſe that be learned doe know, that there be diuers ſortes of ignorance, and of diuers degrees, wherof *affected* is the moſt culpable, ſo as this is very impertinēt, for that albeit affected ignorance doe not excuſe him; yet ſome other leſſe faulty may doe it. And this for the ſenſe, but if wee looke vpō the words themſelues of *Tolet*, cited by this man in the margent wee ſhall diſcouer much more impertinency or impudency rather: for they are theſe: *Ignorantia craſſa non excuſat aliquē a pertinacia*, groſſe ignorance doth not excuſe a man frō pertinacy. Now groſſe ignorance and affected ignorance are two different thinges, which may be vnderſtood by this exāple, that one may be ignorant of Catholicke Religion by *groſſe ignorance*, in that attending to worldly affaires, he doth not care to informe himſelf, but he is ignorant by *affected ignorance*, that doth purpoſely fly to be informed; ſo as heere ſtill our ignorant Miniſter either *ex ignorantia craſſa* or *affectata*, telleth vs *quid pro quo*, in tranſlating *affected ignorance, for groſſe ignorance*, & then againe in Engliſhing *non excuſat aliquem a pertinacia*, doth argue him an obſtinate Hereticke, for that it is one thing to argue, and an other not to excuſe. And wheras before T. M. held that pertinacy apperteined not at all to the nature of Hereſy, here contrary-wiſe he tranſlateth *pertinacia, an obſtinate Heretick*, making it to ſignify both ſubſtantiue, and adiectiue, ſubſtance and quality. But yet further then this yow muſt note that in citing this ſentence out of *Tolet* he cunningly diſſembleth the Authors aſſertion ſet downe cleerly

Tolet abuſed.

Lib. 1 Iuſt. Sacer. c. 19

not

not six lines before these wordes: *pertinacia necessaria est ad constituendum hominem Hæreticum*: Pertinacy is necessary to make a man an Hereticke, being the quite contrary propositiõ to that of this man before set downe in the first example of his corruptions in this former Part of his Reply.

50. But the greatest corruption in this page (and it is notable indeed) is of the wordes sense and meaning of our learned Countreyman *Sayer*, of whome T. M. writeth thus: In breif our Countreyman vpon this case of conscience saith; *an obstinate Hereticke is aswell he that is presumed so to be, as he that is manifest*, and againe in the same page: *seeing therfore that* (as your great Casuist hath said) *euery one presumed to be an Hereticke, is taken for an obstinate, who can be free from your censures? &c.* And then citeth in the margent these wordes of *Sayer*: *Contumax Hæreticus est tam præsumptus quam manifestus*: An obstinate Hereticke is aswell he that is presumed to be so, as he that is manifest or knowne for such, which may seeme to be a great iniustice in our doctrine. But if I doe not shew this deuise to be one of the most manifest and faithles deceiptes and corruptions that euer any honest man put in paper against his aduersary, then let me be censured for to sharpe a Reprehẽder.

5. example

Sayer. in casib. conf. l. 1. c. 9. §. 30.

A notable falsificatiõ of *Sayer*.

51. For first *Sayer* hath no such matter at all concerning obstinacy in Heresy, his whole purpose being only to declare who may be excommunicated by a Iudge for contumacy in not appearing (which is a different thing from obstinacy or pertinacy) and this whether he be either Hereticke or Catholicke; nay he speaketh either only or principally of Catholickes, who doe shew contumacy in any Court or tribunall, in not appearing or answering, according as they are cited and summoned by a lawfull Iudge, and so he defineth contumacy in these wordes: *Contumacia* (saith he) *nihil aliud est quàm inobedientia quædam, qua ius dicenti*

The definition of cõtumacy.

non paretur: Contumacy is nothing els but a certaine diſobedience, wherby he is not obeied that ſitteth in iudgment. So as heere is no mention or meaning of obſtinacy in Hereſy: and further he putteth downe two ſortes of contumacy thus: *Contumax duobus modis eſſe poteſt, nimirum, manifeſtus & præſumptus*; man may be contumacious in two ſortes or manners, either manifeſt or by preſumption, and he giueth diuers examples of both, as namely, if a man cited doe refuſe openly to appeare, or obey his Iudge, this mans contumacy or diſobedience is publicke, and manifeſt: but if he doe not refuſe, but by idle dilations or ſhiftes putteth of or deludeth the Court, he is preſumed to be contumacious, and ſo may excommunication (if it be a ſpirituall Court) proceed againſt him, as if his contumacy were manifeſt.

52. Now then what hath all this to doe with *Contumax Hæreticus tam præſumptus quàm manifeſtus*? Hath *Sayer* any ſuch word or ſentence? No truly, or ſhall we thinke *Thomas Morton* to be ſo ſimple both in grammer, law, & Deuinity, as that he doth not know what difference there is betweene *contumax* and *pertinax*: wherof the one is a fault in obedience towardes our Superiours, as now hath byn ſhewed; the other in tenacity of opinion as before we haue declared. Or if *Thomas Morton* will not confeſſe this ignorance, but that he know the difference of the wordes, and of their ſignifications, ſenſe, and applications heere vſed by the Authors, then muſt he confeſſe wilfull deceipt in vſing one for the other, and much more in twice tranſlating the wordes *contumax Hæreticus* in this one page, *for an obſtinate Hereticke*, and much more yet in foiſting in the word *Hæreticus*, which *Sayer* hath not; and moſt of all in making his Reader belieue that *contumax, præſumptus* and *manifeſtus* doth ſignify in *Sayer* one that vpon preſumption only is iudged to be as obſtinate an Hereticke,

The difference betvveene cõtumacy and pertinacy.

ticke, as if he were manifeſt, wherof *Sayer* neither ſpake nor meant; but in a quite different ſenſe (not appertaining to Hereſy at all) ſaith, that a man may be condemned as contumacious by preſumption, if he appeare not, or vſeth ſleightes, diuerticles, or delayes, as well as if openly he refuſed to appeare. Now then conſider what a *Miniſter of truth* this is, and of what *naked innocency*, thus perfidiouſly to delude his Reader, & yet to come forth after all with this diſſembled Hypocriſy: *Now let me be beholding vnto yow* (ſaith he) *for an anſwere*. And ſo I thinke he is, but if not ſharpe inough for ſo ſhamefull an abuſe, it may be amended and augmented herafter vpon like occaſions, which euery where are offered throughout his whole booke; and there were no end if I would anſwere him to all.

Many falſe ſhiftes.

Pag. 4.

53. And this now is only in one ſole leafe, and no leſſe may be ſaid about another, that within ſome pages after enſueth, if we would ſtand theron, to wit, where he taketh vpon him to defend *Iohn Caluin* from the imputation of Arrianiſme, obiected by the moderate Anſwerer, not only out of our Catholike writers, but from cheif Proteſtant Authors themſelues: about which point, for that I ſhall be inforced to make a particuler Treatiſe in the third Part of this Chapter, I will heere let the moſt Part of that matter paſſe and examine only a peece therof, to wit, how *Caluin* doth deny the Sonne of God to be *Deum de Deo, lumen de lumine*, God of God, and light of light, as the firſt generall Councell of *Neece* did decree againſt the *Arrians*, wherof T.M. writeth thus: Your Ieſuit *Bellarmine* reckoneth vp *Caluin* and *Beza* to be of this opinion, and I thinke he ſaith truly &c. But now this doctrine being examined with the eye, not ouercaſt with the webbe of preiudice, doth in the iudgment of your ſaid famous *Bellarmine* ſeeme Catholicall, *bycauſe they deny not the Sonne to be from the Father, but they deny the eſſence*

6. example

Pag. 20.

VVhether Caluin denied Chriſt to be God of God.

„ *of the Godhead to haue any generation*, this likewise is not
„ the Part of common modesty, to blind-fold your self,
„ and strike yow know not whome.

54. And who would not thinke heere vpon this asseueration of T. M. but that *Cardinall Bellarmine* were cõtrary to himself in accusing *Caluin*, and yet iustifying his doctrine: yow shall see then how many sleightes heere are vsed for deceiuing the Reader. First *Bellarmine* beginneth his Treatise of this matter thus in the place cited by T. M. *Est noua quædam Hæresis &c.* *Bellar. l. 2 de Christo cap. 19.*

„ There is a new kinde of Heresy sprung vp in our dayes,
„ which I know not whether it consist in the thing it
„ self, or in wordes only: *Genebrard* doth of purpose con-
„ fute the same in his bookes of the blessed Trinity, cal-
„ ling it the Heresy of *Autotheans*, that is to say, of such
„ as doe hold Christ to be God of himself, and not of
„ his Father, and both he and Bishop *Lindan* and *Petrus*
„ *Canisius* doe ascribe the same vnto *Caluin*, of which er-
„ rour doth manifestly follow, that either the Sonne is
„ not distinguished personally from the Father, which
„ is the Heresy of *Sabellius*, or that he is distinguished in
„ nature, which goeth neere to the heresy of the *Manichies*. So *Bellarmine*. Who as yow see holdeth the proposition to be Hereticall, that *Christ is God of himself*, being vnderstood simply as the ancient Church vnderstood it, and namely the Councell of *Neece*, when they set downe the contrary doctrine as true and necessary to saluation, to belieue that Christ *is God of God, and light of light*.

55. But now *Caluin* and *Beza*, (as also *M. VVillet*, and *Doctor Fulke* their schollers) in a particuler sense (saith our Minister) doe deny Christ to be God of God, to wit, that the essence of his Godhead hath no generation, though as he is Sonne, and the second person in Trinity, he is by generation from his Father; which doctrine he saith our *Bellarmine* doth hold for Catholicall,

licall, whose words he alledgeth in the margent thus: *Dum rem ipsam excutio, non facilè audeo pronunciare illos in errore fuisse*, while I doe examine well the thing it self, I dare not presume to pronoũce them to haue byn in errour, to wit *Caluin* and *Beza*; wheras *Bellarmins* wordes are, *dum rem ipsam excutio, & Caluini sententias diligenter considero, non facilè audeo pronunciare illum in hoc errore fuisse*, while I examine the matter it self, and diligently consider *Caluins* opinions, I doe not easily presume to pronounce him to haue byn in this errour, to wit in the particuler errour or heresy of *Autotheans*, set downe and confuted by *Genebrard*, and in his sense condemned expressely by the ancient Catholicke Church, for denying Christ to be, and to haue his essence from the Father; but yet though in some sense it seemeth to *Bellarmine*, that *Caluin* may be excused in this priuate & particuler meaning of his, yet not absolutly, as T. M. would make his Reader to thinke, by striking out cũningly the particle *hoc* (this errour) and leauing the word *errour* in common, as though *Bellarmine* had excused him from all kinde of errour, which is most false, for that presently after he both impugneth of purpose and confuteth by many argumentes his manner of speach, as Hereticall in this behalf.

Bellarmins vvordes fraudulently alleadged.

56. *Restat* (saith he) *vt modum loquendi Caluini qui dicit filium à se habere essentiam simpliciter esse repudiandum, & contrario modo loquendum esse demonstremus &c.* It remaineth that we doe demonstrate *Caluins* manner of speech, that saith the Sonne to haue his essence of himself, is simply to be reiected, and that we must speake in a quite contrary manner, to wit, that the Sonne hath not only his person, but essence also from the Father, and so is God of God and light of light, as the Councell of *Neece* declared; and this he proueth by foure wayes: first, *Quia pugnat cum verbo Dei*, for that *Caluins* manner of speech is opposite to the word of God &c.

Caluins manner of speech cõdemned by Bellarmine.

Pugnat

Pugnat secundò cum Conciliis, and secondly it is repugnant to the manner of speech of ancient Councells, as the *Nicene* & others: *Pugnat tertiò cum doctrina Patrum*, thirdly it is contrary to the doctrine of the old Fathers: fourthly it agreeth with the speech of the old *Arrians*, and other such proofes, which *Bellarmine* doth prosecute at large, confirming each one of these members by diuers examples and instances, & that *Caluin* spake Heretically in fauour of the *Arrians* in this behalfe.

57. So as the cosenage heere of striking out (*hoc*) out of *Bellarmins* wordes, making him to say *non audeo pronunciare illos in errore fuisse*, insteed of *illum in hoc errore fuisse*, though it be small in sound of words: yet in substance is it much: for that therby T. M. would make his Reader belieue, that *Bellarmine* cleereth *Caluin* and *Beza* from all sortes of errour in this point, & for that purpose turneth *illum* into *illos*, and *hoc errore*, into *errore* that is to say *him* into *them* and *this errour* into *any errour at all:* wheras *Bellarmine* though in one sense he excuse him; yet absolutly doth he condemne him, as yow haue heard; and no man can deny but that his Latin wordes were heere fraudulently and perfidiously alledged and mangled by T. M. for that he could not doe it but wittingly, and of purpose; and yet forsooth this man will not Equiuocate, as he saith, for a world, though lye he will manifestly for much lesse as yow see. And so much of this vntill we come to examine the matter more largely afterward in the third Part of this Chapter.

7. example

58. And heere I will passe ouer many thinges that might be noted out of the sequent pages mamely 30. 31. 34. where he doth so peruert, and abuse both the wordes, discourse, and sense of diuers Authors alledged by him, as is not credible to him, that doth not compare them with the bookes themselues, from whence they are taken. As for example *Royardus* the

Pag. 30. 31. 34.

Francis-

Franciscane Friar is brought in with commendation of *an honest Friar*, for that he saith, that a King when he is made by the people, can not be deposed by them againe at their pleasure, which is the same doctrine that all other Catholickes doe hold, so long as he conteineth himself within the nature of a King, for that otherwise (which is the question in cõtrouersy) *Royard* himself saith *parendum ei non esse*, that he is not to be obeyed, but this is not to be iudged by the people, and their mutiny, as Protestant Doctors teach.

Royard. Serm. 1. in Domin. 1. Aduent.

Royard. Serm. 2. in Domin. 23. post Pentecost.

59. And to like effect he citeth a discourse, though most brokenly alledged out of Bishop *Cunerus*, writing against the Rebells of *Flanders*, and testifying that it lieth not in the peoples hand to reiect their Prince at their pleasure, as those Protestant subiectes did; and then *M. Morton*, as though he had achieued some great victory, triumpheth exceedingly, saying: *That forsomuch as Friars in our Councells haue no voice, but only Bishops, he hath brought forth a Bishop against vs*, whome for that the moderate Answerer had named a little before, this man scornfully telleth him *Cæsarem appellasti, ad Cæsarem ibis*, yow haue appealed to *Cunerus*, and now he shalbe your Iudge against yow. And is not this great folly and insolency? for that *Cunerus* in all that his booke saith nothing against vs, but altogeather for vs, to represse the Rebellion in *Flanders*, as hath byn signified. And secõdly notwithstanding all this exact obediẽce, which both he and we prescribe, and require at subiectes handes towardes their lawfull Princes, he hath a speciall Chapter which is the third after this alledged heere by T. M. wherin he doth expressely, & largly proue that in some cases when Princes fall into intollerable disorders, there is authority left in the common-wealth, and Church of Christ to restraine, and remoue them. What falshood is this then to alledge Authors thus directly against their owne sense, meaning,

Royardus & Cunerus abused.

Act. 25.

Cap. 3.

ning, and whole drift? doth this become a *Miniſter of ſimple truth?* Is this for a man that ſomuch abhorreth Equiuocation?

00. I let paſſe as trifles in this very place (but yet ſuch as ſhew a guilty minde and meaning,) that he citing the booke of *Alexander Carerius*, a Doctor of the Canon law in *Padua*, which he wrote of late *de Poteſtate Romani Pontificis*, putteth in of his owne *contra huius temporis Hæreticos* againſt the Heretickes of this time, which are not in the title of that booke; and then wheras the ſaid Author naming or citing many other writers to be of his opinion, doth ſay *nuperrimè verò Celſus Mancinus in tract. de Iuribus Principatuum &c.* and laſt of all *Celſus Mancinus* doth hold the ſame in a certaine Treatiſe of the rightes of principalities; this man to frame vnto himſelf ſome matter of inſultation, turneth *verò* into *verè*, and then playeth ridiculouſly vpon his owne fiction in theſe wordes: *Carerius citeth another called Celſus, by interpretation high or lofty, and therfore inſignes him with verè Celſus, as truly ſo named, and ſo truly he may be if we iudge him by the loftines of his ſtile, and concluſion.* So he. And doe yow ſee this folly? Or will yow thinke it rather folly then falſhood, that could not diſcerne betweene *verò* and *verè?* Or not be able to iudge by the contexture of *Carerius* his ſpeech it ſelfe, that it could not by apt conſtruction be *verè* if he had lighted vpon a corrupt coppy, as he could not; for that there is but one, and that hath very plainly *verò*, and conſequently all this Commentary of *Thomas Morton* is out of his owne inuention. And where now is the *aſſurance of his vpright conſcience* proteſted to his Maieſty in his Epiſtle dedicatory? where is his *ſimplicity in Chriſt Ieſus?* where his *naked innocency?* Can this be ignorance? can this be done but of purpoſe, and conſequently by a guilty conſcience? what may the hearer belieue of all he ſaith, when euery where he is found intangled with

8. example

Pag. 34.

Carerius corrupted

ſuch

ſuch fooliſh treachery? But let vs proceed.

61. There followeth within two leaues after a heape not only of falſhoodes, but alſo of impudencies. For wheras his Aduerſary the moderate Anſwerer had ſaid, that not only Kinges, but Popes alſo for Hereſy, by the Canon lawes were to be depoſed, he Anſwereth thus: The Authors of the doctrine of depoſing Kinges in caſe of Hereſy, doe profeſſe concerning Popes, *that they cannot poßibly be Heretickes, as Popes; and conſequently cannot be depoſed*; Not ſaith *Bellarmine*, by any power Eccleſiaſticall or tẽporall, no not by all Biſhops aſſembled in a Councell: Not, ſaith *Carerius* though he ſhould doe any thing preiudiciall to the vniuerſall State of the Church: Not ſaith *Azorius*, though he ſhould neglect the Canons Eccleſiaſticall, or peruert the Lawes of Kinges: Not ſaith *Gratians* gloſſe, though he ſhould carry infinite multitudes of ſoules with him to hell: and theſe forenamed Authors doe auouch for the confirmation of this doctrine, the vniuerſall conſent of Romiſh Deuines and Canoniſtes, for the ſpace of an hundred yeares. So he. And in theſe wordes are as many notorious and ſhameleſſe lies, as there are aſſertions, and Authors named by him for the ſame.

9. example

Pag. 38. » » » *Bellar l.4 de Rom. Pont. c.2.* *Carer. l.1. cap 14.* *Azor. lib. 5. cap. 14.* » Gratian. Canon. Si Papa. diſt. 40. » »

62. For firſt the foure writers which he mentioneth there in the text, to wit, *Bellarmine*, *Carerius*, *Azorius* and *Gratian*, doe expreſſely, cleerly, and reſolutly hold the contrary to that he affirmeth out of them, for that they teach and proue by many argumentes, that Popes both may fall into Hereſies, and for the ſame be depoſed by the Church, or rather are *ipſo facto* depoſed, and may be ſo declared by the Church, and their wordes heere guilfully alledged by T. M. as ſounding to the contrary, are manifeſtly ſpoken, and meant of manners only, and not of faith, that is to ſay, if they ſhould be of naughty life, yet haue they no Superiours to depoſe them for that (being immediatly vnder Chriſt)

that Popes may fall into Hereſy & be depoſed for the ſame.

but for Hereſy they may be depoſed, which in ſteed of all the reſt, yow may read largly handled in *Bellarmine*, in his ſecond booke *de Pontific. cap.*30. where among other proofes he citeth this very Canon of *Gratian* heere mentioned by T. M. ſaying: *Hæreticum Papam poſſe iudicari, expreſsè habetur Canon. Si Papa diſt.*40. It is expreſſely determined in the Canon *Si Papa*, that a Pope falling into Hereſy may be iudged, and depoſed by the Church; and more, that in the eight generall Councell, and ſeauenth Seſsion, Pope *Honorius* was depoſed for Hereſy. So *Bellarmine*. And the ſame doctrine hold the other two cited by our Miniſter: ſo as heere be foure notorious lies togeather, that by no ſhift or tergiuerſation can be auoided, for that T. M. could not but manifeſtly ſee, that he alledged theſe foure Authors quite contrary to their expreſſe wordes, drift and meaning, what then will yow ſay of this fellow, and his manner of writing? ſhall he be credited herafter?

63. But yet not contented with this he citeth other foure or fiue Authors beſides in the margent, to wit *Gregorius de Valentia*, *Salmeron*, *Canus*, *Stapleton* and *Coſterus*, all which in the very places by him cited, are expreſſely againſt him. And is not this ſtrange dealing? Let *Canus* that goeth in the middeſt, ſpeake for all, who hauing proued firſt at large the oppoſite propoſition to T. M. to wit, that Popes may fall into Hereſy, and be depoſed for the ſame, concludeth thus his diſcourſe; *Non eſt igitur negandum* (ſaith he) *quin Summus Pontifex Hæreticus eſſe poßit:* It cannot therfore be denied, but that the Pope may be an Hereticke, adding preſently: *VVherof one or two examples may be giuen, but none at all, that euer Pope though he fell into Hereſy, did decree the ſame for the whole Church*; by which laſt wordes of *Canus* is diſcouered the ridiculous fallacy of T. M. alledging heere out of our foreſaid writers, *that Popes cannot*

Gregor. de Val. analys. l. 8. c. 3
Salm. com. in Gal. 2. diſp 24.
Canus l. 6 Loc. Theo c. 8.
Stap. doct. Princ. l. 6. initio.
Coſter. de Pontif. in Enchirid cap. 3.

not posibly be Heretickes, as Popes, and consequently cannot be deposed: Wherof they say the flat contrary, as you haue heard, that Popes may be Heretickes as Popes, & consequently may be deposed; but yet that God, as Popes, will neuer permit them to decree any Hereticall doctrine to be held by the Church.

Though Popes may fall into Heresy yet shall they not be permitted to decree it.

64. Consider then I pray yow what a fellow this Minister is in abusing thus so many Authors so manifestly; but especially doe yow note the impudency of his conclusion: *And these forenamed Authors* (saith he) *doe auouch for confirmation of this doctrine, the vniuersall consent of Romish Deuines and Canonistes for the space of an hundred years.* Pag. 38. So he. But I would aske him of what doctrine? that Popes cannot be Heretickes, or be deposed for the same? yow haue heard them now protest the contrary, and yow may read it in the places heere cited, out of all the nine seuerall writers before mentioned, who by their expresse contrary doctrine doe proue *Thomas Morton* to haue made nine seuerall lies against them in this his assertion, and now the tenth & most notorious of all, is this his conclusion; *That they doe auouch for confirmation of that which he obiecteth the vniuersall consent of Romish Deuines and Canonistes for the space of an hundred yeares*; which besides the manifest falsity therof, seene in their owne wordes, and workes heere by me cited, it conteineth also great folly, and simplicity to say, that they auouch *the consent of Romish Deuines and Canonistes for an hundred yeares*; for that their proofes are much elder, and *Bellarmine* among the rest, for deposition of Pops doth cite the eight generall Councell vnvnder Pope *Adrian* the second, for aboue six hundred yeares gone, and the Canon *Si Papa*, out of our Countreyman *S. Boniface* Archbishop of *Mentz* & Martyr, aboue seauen hundred yeares gone, and collected by *Gratian*, and confirmed by Popes, as Part of the Canon law aboue foure hundred yeares gone: So as to say

Ten lies made at one time.

that now they auouch Authors *of an hundred yeares old* againſt that which for ſo many hundred yeares before was held & eſtabliſhed, is mere folly or rather fooliſh malice.

30. Example. 65. And albeit I haue not yet paſſed ouer the firſt halfe of the firſt Part of this firſt Treatiſe of his, and in this alſo haue pretermitted willingly many other examples that might haue byn alledged, yet finding my ſelf weary, to proſecute any further ſo large a labyrinth of theſe intricate iuggling tricks, vſed by this Miniſter in his whole corpes of citations, with doe conſiſt principally therof; I meane to draw to an end adding only one example more in this place, about a matter more neerly concerning our argument, which is of reconciliation of Proteſtantes with Catholickes

Pag. 55. in pointes of Religion, which T. M. willing to accuſe Ieſuites, as the only hinderers therof writeth thus: *Only by the inſolency* (ſaith he) *of Ieſuites all ſuch hope of recõciliation is debarred, as is plaine by Bellarmine; for whereas that moſt graue and learned Caſſander honoured of two Emperours for his ſinguler learning and piety*, did teach that

Bellar. l. de Laicis cap. 19.

Caſſand. l. de officio pij viri.

Emperours ſhould endeauour a reconciliatiõ betwixt Papiſtes and Proteſtantes, bycauſe (ſaith he) Proteſtants hold the articles of the Creed, & are true members of the Church, although they diſſent from vs in ſome particuler opinions; the grand Ieſuite doth anſwere, that this iudgment of *Caſſander* is falſe, for that Catholickes cannot be reconciled with Heretickes, Heretically meaning Proteſtantes. So he.

66. But heere I would aske him why he had not vttered alſo that which immediatly followeth in *Bellarmine*, that *Iohn Caluin* had written a booke againſt this errour of *Caſſander*, and that among Catholicke writers *Iohannes à Louanio* had done the ſame, and ſhewed that it was an old Hereſy of *Appelles*, as *Euſebius* teſtifieth, & of other Heretickes afterward vnder *Zeno*

the

the Emperours, named *Pacifiers*, as *Euagrius* testifieth, who held that Catholickes and Heretickes might be composed togeather: why (I say) did T. M. conceale this? As also the many, great, and strong argumentes, that *Bellarmine* alledgeth to proue his assertion? And why would he lay all the fault of not agreeing, vpon the insolency of Iesuites, seeing *Iohannes à Louanio* was no Iesuit, nor *Caluin* neither.

Euseb. 5. Hist. c. 13. Euagr. l. 3. Hist. c. 14. & 30.

67. But to leaue this, & to come to the thing it self, and to take some more particuler view of the false behauiour of *Thomas Morton* in citing this authority: It is strange that in so small a matter, he would shew so great want of truth, or true meaning as heere he doth. For first, to pretermit that he goeth about to deceaue his Reader, by the opinion of grauity and learning in *George Cassander* of *Bruges*, who was but a Grammarian in his dayes; & that he was a Catholicke, who is censured for an Hereticke *primæ classis* in the Index of prohibited bookes, and not only for Heresies of this time, but also, *quod dicit spiritum sanctum minùs aduocandum, & adorandum esse*; for that he saith that the holy Ghost is lesse to be called vpon or adored &c. as the *Index expurgatorius* testifieth; besides all this (I say) he corrupteth manifestly in the sentence before alledged, the wordes, & plaine meaning of his Author, to wit, *Bellarmine*, from whome he citeth *Cassanders* iudgment: for thus they lye in him: *Tertius error* (saith he) *est Georgij Cassandri in libro* De officio pij viri, *vbi docet debere Principes inuenire rationem pacis inter Catholicos, Lutheranos &c. Sed interim dum non inueniunt, debere permittere vnicuiq; suam fidem, modò omnes recipiant Scripturam & Symbolum Apostolicum: Sic enim omnes sunt vera Ecclesiæ membra, licèt in particularibus dogmatibus dissentiant.*

Cassander vvhat mãner of mã he vvas.

Index expurg. in l. Cassand. De officio pij viri. fol. 314.

Bellar. l. de laicis cap. 19.

68. The third errour is of *George Cassander* in the booke *Of the office of a pious man* where he teacheth that Princes ought to seeke out some meanes of peace, betwixt Catho-

Catholickes, Lutheranes, Caluiniſtes, and other ſectes of our time, but in the meane ſpace, whiles they finde no ſuch meanes, they ought to permit euery one to follow his owne particuler faith, ſo as all doe receaue the Scripture, and common Creed of the Apoſtles, for ſo al are true members of the Church, albeit they diſagree among thẽſelues in particuler doctrines. Theſe are *Bellarmins* wordes. Now let vs ſee how they are mangled by *M. Morton*, both in Latin and Engliſh, as by him that hath the notableſt talent therin, notwithſtanding his ſolemne proteſtations to the contrary, that euer I read in my life.

69. He putteth downe firſt the Latin wordes in his margent thus: *Debent Principes inuenire rationem pacis inter Catholicos, Lutheranos, Caluiniſtas; qui omnes dum Symbolum tenent Apoſtolicum, vera ſunt membra Eccleſiæ, licèt à nobis in particularibus diſſentiant.* Princes ought to ſeeke a meanes of peace betweene Catholickes, Lutheranes, Caluiniſtes; all which, for ſo much as they hold the Apoſtolicke Creed, are true members of the Church, albeit they diſſent from vs in ſome particuler opiniõs. And heere now yow ſee firſt to be omitted cunningly and wilfully by this crafty Miniſter the wordes of much moment, that whiles Princes doe not finde a fit meane of peace, they ought to permit all to liue according to their particuler faith, which ſentence of his *graue and learned Caſſander*, not ſeeming to himſelf allowable in our Engliſh State, or to his owne Brethren the Engliſh *Caluiniſtes*, that now hauing gotten the gouernment, will ſuffer no other Religion but their owne, thought beſt to ſuppreſſe and cut them quite out: Secondly in ſteed of the condicionall ſpeech vſed by *Caſſander, modò omnes recipiant Scripturam &c.* So all doe receaue the Scripture and Apoſtolicall Creed, he putteth it downe with a cauſatiue clauſe, *Qui omnes dum Symbolum tenent &c.* All which ſectes becauſe they doe hold

Caſſanders iudgment not allowed by English Proteſtãts.

hold the Articles of the Creed, are true members of the Church, leauing out the word *Scripture*, as yow see and peruerting the other wholly in sense. For who will not hold it absurde, that *Catholickes*, *Lutherans*, *Caluinistes*, and other sectes of our time, though in wordes they doe admit both Scripture & Apostolicall Creed, yet differing in sense, and so many doctrines as they doe, are all to be held notwithstanding for true members of one, and the selfe same Church? Can any thing be more ridiculous then this?

70. Thirdly he doth most notably cogge in thrusting in the wordes *à nobis*, *from vs*, which are not in the originall, meaning therby to make *Cassander* to seeme a Catholicke, & to speake in the behalf of Catholickes, which is plaine cosenage: and to this end also he leaueth out *dogmatibus*; & finally yow see that he shapeth euery thing to his owne purpose, and by making *Cassander*, as a Catholicke, seeme to wish and endeauour this vnion, and *Bellarmine* to reiect it; he would confirme his former calumniation, *that only by the insolency of Iesuites all such hope is debarred.*

71. And thus much for the corruption of the Latin text: but his English hath other corruptions also, according to his ordinary custome. For first he translateth *Debent Principes*, that Emperours should endeauour a reconciliation, to confirme therby his former vanity, that *Cassander* was so great a man with Emperours, as he talketh not but to Emperours: Secõdly he translateth *Catholicos*, *Lutheranos*, *Caluinistas &c.* which wordes *& cætera* comprehend all other sects of our time, as *Anabaptistes*, *Arrians*, *Trinitarians*, *Hussites*, *Picardians* and the like, he translateth them (I say,) *Papistes* and *Protestantes*, as though all those sectes of our time were to be comprehended vnder the name of Protestantes of the English faith, or as though *Cassander* if he were a Catholicke, as heere he is pretended, would call vs *Papistes*

The sleights of his English translatiõ.

1.

2.

3. *piſtes*: Thirdly wheras in his owne Latin heere ſet downe he ſaith; *Qui omnes dum Symbolum tenent &c.* All which, to wit Catholickes, Lutherans, Caluiniſtes, & other Sectaries, whiles they hold the Apoſtolicall Creed, are true members of the Church, he doth Engliſh it thus, *becauſe Proteſtantes hold the Articles of the Creed, and are true members of the Church*, excluding Catholickes from belieuing the ſaid Articles, or being true members, which in his owne Latin (and that of
4. *Bellarmines*) alſo are included: and fourthly is the corruption before mentioned, *although they diſſent from vs in ſome particuler opinions*; which in *Bellarmine* is, *although they diſſent among themſelues in particuler doctrines*: and finally the wordes by him cited of *Bellarmins* iudgment,
5. which he controlleth, to wit, *falſa eſt hæc ſententia Caſſandri; non poſſunt enim Catholici reconciliari cum Hæreticis*, are not ſo in *Bellarmine*, but theſe, *poteſt facilè refelli hæc (Caſſandri) ſententia: primum enim non poſſunt Catholici, Lutherani, & Caluiniſtæ eo modo conciliari &c.* This ſentence (of *Caſſander*) may eaſely be refelled; firſt for that *Catholickes, Lutherans*, and *Caluiniſtes* (for example) can not ſo be reconciled as *Caſſander* appointeth, to wit, by admitting only the wordes of the Creed, for that we differ in the ſenſe, and ſometimes in the articles themſelues, as in that *deſcendit ad inferos*, he deſcended into hell; and in like manner, we agree not about the ſenſe of thoſe other articles, *I belieue the Catholicke Church* and *Communion of Saintes, remiſſion of ſinnes &c.* So *Bellarmine*. All which this fellow omitteth.

Bellarmines opinion falſified.

72. And ſo you ſee there is no truth or ſincerity with him in any thing: neither can theſe eſcapes be aſcribed any way to ouerſight, errour, miſtaking, or forgetfulnes, but muſt needes be attributed to wilfull fraude, & malicious meaning, purpoſly to deceaue, as the things themſelues doe euidently declare, for which cauſe, I ſhall leaue him to be cenſured by his owne Brethren,

The concluſion.

but

but especially by his Lord and Maister, for so notable discrediting their cause by so manifest false manner of proceeding; and yet for that there is one example more, that remaineth within the compasse of these few Pages by vs examined, that draweth a longer sequele after it, then is fit to weary the Reader withall, without some breathing, we shall reserue the same to a third Part of this Chapter which now ensueth.

THE THIRD PART OF THIS CHAPTER, CONTEYNING A CONTROVERSY:

VVhether *Caluin* did fauour Arianiſme, or no?

VVith diuers ſleightes of Tho. Morton *about the ſame.*

AND now albeit theſe examples before rehearſed, doe ſufficiently declare the mans humour againſt whome we deale, who profeſsing extraordinary ſincerity in all pointes, performeth the ſame ſcarcely in any (*I profeſſe*, ſaith he, *that ſimplicity in Chriſt, as neuer either in word, or writing to Equiuocate*:) yet for an vpſhot of this Chapter, I haue thought good, to lay forth one example more, to proue worſe matter then Equiuocation againſt him, as in the former Partes of this Chapter we haue already done, to wit, plaine falſhood, and faithles dealing. But heere now is a particuler controuerſy fallen out, by occaſion of certaine

certaine ſleightes, vſed by him in defence of *Iohn Caluin*, againſt the imputation of *Arrianiſme* laid vpō him, not only by our doctors, but much more by ſundry learned Proteſtāt-writers of *Germany*, alledged in part by the moderate Anſwerer in this place, and ſhifted of ſleightly by T. M. And albeit we haue treated ſomewhat of this matter before, in the ſecond Chapter of this booke, yet the thing comming againe in queſtion now by reaſon of certaine corruptions vſed by T. M. therabout, I haue thought it expedient to handle the ſame more largely as a point of no ſmall importance, which by the ſequele yow will ſee.

74. Firſt then T. M. taking vpon him to anſwere the obiection of his Aduerſary, *That Caluin was accuſed of Arrianiſme, by the writinges of diuers moſt learned Proteſtantes of the Lutheran and other ſectes in Germany*, & hauing giuen this feeble anſwere only, which before we haue touched in our ſaid ſecond Chapter, and is heere repeated againe, *That it is not much to be regarded, what thoſe Proteſtant-writers in the ſpirit of oppoſition and contention did ſay of Caluin: eſpecially* (ſaith he) *ſeing as it may ſeeme by their obiections, their iudgment hath beene depraued by your maliguant Doctors.* Pag. 17.

75. After (I ſay) this generall, but ſimple euaſion (for if this kinde of anſwering may be admitted, that thinges are ſpoken or written out of the ſpirit of Contradiction, what may not be anſwered?) he taketh vpon him for ſome ſhew of probability in this ſhift to ſet downe the iuſtification following. Firſt (ſaith he) concerning Arrianiſme, *Caluin* as your Ieſuits affirme, doth plainly teach the ſame, ſaying; *That the Father is by a kind of excellency God*, wheras both the ſpeach & ſenſe is moſt orthodoxall, and agreing with the tenure of holy writ, as your learned Ieſuites confeſſe: for the wordes of our Sauiour are plaine *Ioan.* 14. *My Father is greater then I*, in the true ſenſe, *Is* (ſay your Ieſuites, and truly) *Tolet. com. in Ioan. 14 & Mald. in eundē locum.*

„ truly) *the Father greater, not in ſubſtance and being, but by*
„ *reaſon of birth and begetting*; For their authority they
„ produce an inqueſt of Fathers to free *Caluin* in this
„ point, who was ſo farre from Arrianiſme, that your
„ owne *Bellarmine* doth acknowledge that *Caluin* did im-
„ pugne the doctrine of the Arrians.

76. This is his defence, wherin yow ſhall ſee how many ſubtilties, and ſhiftes there be vſed to defend *Caluin* from this impiety, who yet, as will appeare, is not defenſible in this reſpect. For firſt where he ſaith, *That our Ieſuites doe affirme Iohn Caluin to teach Arrianiſme*, in that he holdeth that the Father is by a kind of excellency God, citing for the ſame among others in the margent both *Bellarmine*, and *Gregorius de Valentia*, his firſt corruption therin is, that he citeth not the wordes of their accuſations, as they ly in the Authors, which in *Bellarmine* are theſe: *Non veretur Valentino concedere, nomen Dei* KATH' HYPEROCHEN, *id eſt, per excellentiam quandam, ſoli Patri attribui*; *Caluin* feared not to grant to *Valentinus Gentilis* (the Arrian Hereticke) that the name of God was attributed only to the Father by a certaine excellency. And the ſame obiecteth * *Gregory de Valentia* in the ſame wordes: out of which yow ſee, that T. M. leaueth out *ſoli*, to the Father alone, wherin conſiſteth the chiefeſt force of the charge againſt *Caluin*: this then is the firſt tricke. The ſecond is, that he would make his Reader belieue, that for this only ſpeach of *Caluin* our Doctors, *Bellarmine*, *Valentia*, and others, had condemned him of *Arrianiſme*, wheras they not only for this, but for many other wicked ſpeaches, as blaſphemous as this, doe aſcribe that crime vnto him.

Bell. præf. l. de Chriſto §. Sed iam. & l. de notis Eccleſ. c. 9. & de Chriſto media. c. 3. & 8.

** Greg. de Valent. l. 1 de vnit. & trinit. c. 9.*

Diuers Arrian ſpeeches of Caluin.

77. As for example, for that he writeth *Deum Patrem genuiſſe quia voluit*, that God the Father did beget his Sonne for that he would, wherof enſueth euidently that if Chriſtes eternall generation was voluntary in reſpect

respect of his Father, then was it not necessary, and naturall, and consequently he could not be God at all, nor equall to his Father, of whose will his essence depended: and againe, *That Christ as he is the second person of the Trinity, cannot properly be called Creator of heauen and earth*, and consequently not God, nor equall to his Father. And yet further, *Filium Dei subiectum esse Patri etiam ratione diuinitatis*, that the Sonne of God is subiect to his Father, euen according to his diuine nature. And yet more impiously, *That Christ was a mediator betweene God and Angels before the sinne of Adam, and before his incarnation, and that also according to his diuinity:* Out of which for that a mediator must needes be inferiour to him, to whome he vseth mediation, all learned men inferre that *Caluin* in effect taught the doctrine of *Arrius*, who denied the equality of the Sonne with the Father, & all this is obiected by our Doctors in the places quoted by T. M. himselfe. Wherby it is manifest that he did not of ignorance or forgetfulnes leaue out these other accusations, mentioning only the first, but of plaine deceipt, & wilfull falshood, for that he thought himselfe to haue a shift for answering the first, but not the other.

Caluin. l. cõtr. Gentilem in Conf. 10. proth.

Calu. l. 2. Instit. c. 14

78. Yet *Gregory de Valentia* goeth some-what further, adding moreouer to these assertions of *Caluin* diuers other; as namely that he did seeke to eneruate, and make voide, togeather with the *Arrians*, certaine excellent places of Scripture, which the ancient Catholicke Fathers did vrge against them, as that of *S. Iohn*; *Ego & Pater vnum sumus*, I and my Father are one, which *Caluin* saith is to be vnderstood, *of the vnity of consent and agreement, not of substance:* wherupõ one *George Blandrata* a *Trinitarian*, founding himselfe (saith *Valentia*) did in a certaine publicke disputation against the Catholickes, at *Alba Iulia* in *Transiluania*, allow and confirme this *Arrian* interpretation of *Caluin*, saying:

the charge of Gregory de Valentia against Caluin.

Ioan. 10.

Caluin. l. 2. Instituut. cap. 14.

Disp. Albanian. actio. 2. 2. diei.

VVe doe

VVe doe remit our hearers to only Iohn Caluin *in this behalfe who doth euery where reprehend the old writers, for that they wreſted theſe wordes,* Ego & Pater vnum ſumus, *to the vnity of eſſence or ſubſtance.* He noteth alſo theſe wordes in *Caluin, Impropriam eſſe atque duram orationem illam Symboli Niceni,* Deus de Deo: that, that ſpeach of the Creed of the Councell of *Nice,* is an improper and hard ſpeech, *God of God*: Which ſpeech notwithſtanding *S. Athanaſius* did greatly vrge (ſaith he) in his dayes againſt the *Arrians,* wherof we haue treated ſomewhat before.

79. Now then may we ſee how fraudulently *Thomas Morton* hath dealt in this matter, by putting downe ſlyly one reaſon only, for which our *malignant Doctors* (as he calleth them) doe condemne *Caluin* for *Arrianiſme,* and it is as if a malefactour being condemned for many crimes, his Aduocate would giue out, that he had byn accuſed only of one, and then by diminiſhing that alſo make it none, and ſo proclaime him quit in all. But for ſo much as he calleth our ſaid Doctors *malignant* (from which crime I dare auouch them of all others moſt free) & doth ſay, *That the iudgment of the Lutheran Doctors, alleadged by his Aduerſary the moderate Anſwerer againſt him* (namely of *Doctor Philippus Nicolaus,* and of the Deane and vniuerſity of *Tubinga,* who condemned *Caluin* for the ſame crime of *Arrianiſme,*) *hath byn deprаued,* (as may ſeeme, ſaith he, by their obiections) *by our ſaid malignant Doctors*; We ſhall heere with as much breuity as may be, bring forth the iudgment of another renowned Proteſtant-Doctor, concurring with the foreſaid, he being a publike Reader of Deuinity in another famous Vniuerſity of *Germany*, namely *VVittenberg*, where *Martyn Luther* himſelfe once held the chaire, as *Caluin* did in *Geneua*; and this Doctor whoſe name is *AEgidius Hunnius* in a ſeuerall Treatiſe ſet forth about a dozen yeares gone, entituled by him *Caluinus Iudaizans*, & dedicated vnto

D. Aegidius Hunnius his booke of Caluin.

one

one *Dauid Pareus* a principall Caluinian Doctor, ſetteth downe the argument of his booke thus, in the firſt front therof. This booke is to ſhew (ſaith he) that *Iohn Caluin* hath moſt deteſtably preſumed to corrupt (*in fauour of Iewes and Arrians*) the moſt cleare places, and teſtimonies of Scripture concerning the glorious Trinity, deity of Chriſt, of the Holy Ghoſt, and aboue all, the predictions of Prophetes for the comming of the *Meßias*, his natiuity, paſsion, aſcenſion, & ſitting at the right hand of God &c. with a cleare cõfutation of his falſe corruptions therin &c.

An. 1593. *VVittenberg. apud viduam Mathæi VVelaci.*

80. This is the title and argument of the booke, which he doth proſecute for almoſt two hundred pages togeather, deuiding the ſame into two partes, the firſt wherin he ſheweth, how *Iohn Caluin* moſt wickedly, and maliciouſly vnder pretence of interpreting the Scripture in different ſenſe from the ancient Fathers, did goe about couertly to weaken, infringe, or take from the Chriſtians all the ſtrongeſt argumentes which they had, or haue out of the Scriptures for the Godhead of Chriſt, and his equality and conſubſtantiality with the Father. And in the ſecond Part, that he vſeth the ſame fraud, and malice by ouerthrowing all the predictions, & foretellinges of Prophetes about Chriſt as he was man.

Out of the old Teſtament. §. 1.

81. ANd for the firſt Part of peruerting Scriptures, he giueth theſe examples out of the old Teſtament, firſt, that wheras *Moyſes* ſaith in *Geneſis*, *Creauit Deus cœlum & terram*, God created heauen and earth, the word in the Hebrue is ELOIM, Gods, in the plu- 1. example Gen. 1.

Hunn. in Calu. Iudaiz. pa. 9.

rall number, out of which *D. Hunnius* proueth, that the ancient Fathers, and most learned also of later times in the Hebrue tongue, doe gather *Moyses* to haue signified the plurality of persons in the Bl. Trinity, but *Caluin* to take from Christians this comforte, saith: *Colligere solent hic in Deo notari tres personas &c.* Heere Christians are wont (by this plurall number ELOIM) to gather, that three persons are signified in God; but for so much as to me it seemeth a weake proofe of so great a matter, the Readers are to be aduertised to be-

2. example

ware of such violent glosses. Thus *Caluin*. And with like spirite of presumption & arrogancy, if not worse, he goeth forward in all the rest, as namely that of

Gen. 19.

Genesis the 19. about raining of brimstome ouer *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, where the wordes are *Pluit Iehoua a Iehoua* (saith *Hunnius* according to the Hebrue text) and is applied by Christian writers, against the Iewes for Christes diuinity, *Caluin* most insolently reiecteth the same saying: *Quod veteres Christi Diuinitatem &c.*

„ wheras ancient writers endeauored by this testimo-
„ ny, to proue the Diuinity of Christ, it is but a weake
„ argument, and in my iudgment they brabble much
„ without cause, that so sharpely vrge the Iewes with
„ this place.

82. In *Genesis* also Chap. 35. where *Iacob* built an Al-

3. example Gen 35.

tar to God, and called the place *Bethel*, for that ELOIM the Gods had appeared vnto him there, vsing the plural number not only in the substantiue, but also in the verbe it selfe, *Caluin* without all probability of reason, will needes haue it meant, that not God, but An-

Hun. p. 17.

gels only appeared, which *Hunnius* refuteth, for that the apparition of Angels was not a sufficient reason to name the place *Bethel*, as *Iacob* did, that is to say, the house of God, or to build an Altar to God, for that Angels only, and not God had appeared to him.

83. But that which much more importeth, *Caluin*

taketh

taketh from the Chriſtians that other excellent place alſo of the ſecond *Pſalme*, wherin is proued the Diuinity of Chriſt by thoſe wordes, *Filius meus es tu, Ego hodie genui te*, Thou art my Sonne, this day haue I begotten thee, wherby *S. Paul* himſelfe *Act.* 13. and the Author (ſaith *Hunnius*) of the Epiſtle to the Hebrues (for that Lutherans doe not admit that Epiſtle to be *S. Paules*) and all ancient Fathers after them, doe alleage theſe wordes for prooſe of Chriſtes diuinity; but *Caluin* doth ouerthrow it by interpreting it to be vnderſtood literally of *Dauid* himſelfe, as *Hunnius* at large proueth, & exactly refuteth, as alſo his impiety, in taking away that other place of the 33. *Pſalme* in like manner, *Verbo Domini cœli firmati ſunt, & ſpiritu oris eius omnis virtus eorum*: The heauens were eſtabliſhed by the word of God, and all their power by his holy ſpirit. Out of which the ancient Fathers proued not only the diuinity of Chriſt, the ſecond perſon in trinity, but of the holy Ghoſt alſo, and conſequently the bleſſed Trinity, which *Caluin* endeauoring to ouerthrow writeth in this manner: *Subtiliùs veteres hoc elogio vſi ſunt &c.* The ancient Fathers did more ſubtily vſe this place of Scripture, againſt the *Sabellian* Heretickes, to proue the eternall Godhead of the holy Ghoſt; but I would not dare to vrge *Sabellius* with this teſtimony to proue the deity of the ſaid holy Ghoſt. And againe in another place *lib.* 1. *Inſtitut. cap.* 13. *ſect.* 15. it ſeemed (ſaith he) a plauſible thing vnto them, to cite out of *Dauid* the wordes now rehearſed, *verbo Domini cœli firmati ſunt &c.* to proue that the Creation of the world was no leſſe the worke of the *holy Ghoſt*, then of the *Sonne* the ſecond perſon in Trinity: *Sed infirma illa ratio fuit*, but that proofe was weake. So *Caluin*, very piouſly as yow ſee.

4 example Pſal. 2.

Heb. 1. & 5

Pag. 21. 22

5. example Pſalm. 33.

Hun. p. 25.

Pag. 28.

84. From this *Doctor Hunnius* paſſeth to examine theſe wordes of the 45. *Pſalme* as ſpoken of the Sonne of God,

6. example Pſalm 45.

of God, *Thronus tuus ô Deus, in ſeculum ſeculi &c. propterea vnxit te Deus, Deus tuus &c.* Thy throne ô Lord is to endure for euer, and therfore hath God, euen thy God anointed thee with the oile of ioyfulnes aboue thy fellowes: which the Author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrues (ſaith *Hunnius*) doth expreſly apply vnto the eternall Diuinity of Chriſt; but *Caluin* ouerthroweth the ſame, by applying the meaning to haue byn of K. *Salomon* only. *The ſimple and naturall ſenſe of this place* (ſaith *Caluin*) *is that* Salomon *did not gouerne Tyrannically, as other Kinges, but with right and equall lawes, and therfore his Kingly ſeate ſhould be ſtable for euer.* See how baſe a conceipt this man had of diuine thinges: but yet heare him further, for in another place he writeth thus: *Faciendum eſt &c. VVe muſt confeſſe that this Pſalme was made of Salomon, as a brideſong of his marriage with the King of Egypts daughter.* Doe yow ſee the prophanity of this mans ſpirit? But yet let vs produce a farre greater audacity of his.

Hebr. 1.

Caluin. in com. in c. 1. ad Hebr.

85. The Apoſtle *S. Paul* in the 4. to the *Epheſians* doth vrge much for proofe of Chriſtes diuinity the wordes of the *Pſalme* 67. *Aſcendens in altum captiuam duxit captiuitatem, dona dedit hominibus &c.* He aſcending vp to heauen, did carry with him our Captiuity as captiue, & diſtributed giftes to men vpon earth: which thing *S. Paul* doth vrge, as a point of ſinguler moment for proofe of Chriſtes diuinity. But what ſaith *Caluin*? yow ſhall heare what he writeth both of the thing, and of his Cenſure of *S. Paules* ſimplicity, in ſo applying the ſame. *Quia locum hunc Paulus* (ſaith he) *ſubtiliùs ad Chriſtum deflexit Epheſ. 4. videndum eſt, quàm bene cum mente Dauidis conuenit:* For ſo much as *Paul* did more ſubtily wreſt this place to Chriſt, it is to be conſidered how well he agreeth therin with the mind or meaning of *Dauid*, ſhewing in deed by diuers reaſons, that his expoſition and application doth not agree with *Dauids* inten-

7. example Pſalm. 67.

Pag. 35.

intention in that Pſalme, which is a moſt impious inſolency if it be well conſidered.

86. After this the ſaid Doctor paſſeth on to cite that famous place of *Eſay* the ſixt, *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Exercituum*, as a teſtimony for the bleſſed Trinity, by the witnes and allegation of al ancient writers, wheras *Caluin* of purpoſe calleth the ſame into doubt, ſaying in fauour of the *Arrians*: Wheras ancient writers haue vſed this teſtimony of *Eſay*, whē they would proue the Trinity of perſons in the eſſence of one God, I doe not reiect their ſentēce; but yet if I ſhould haue to doe with Hereticks, I would rather vſe more ſtrong teſtimonies, *ne Hæreticis ridiculi ſimus*, leaſt we be ridiculous vnto Heretikes, and in truth the Prophet by this triple repetition (*holy, holy, holy*) doth rather note a reſtles aſsiduity, or continuance of Angelicall melody, in the prayſes of God &c. And doe yow not ſee (ſaith *Hunnius*,) how this arrogant fellow, doth *ſaucely pull by the locks old venerable antiquity (making the ſame ridiculou;) and how he inſtructeth the *Arrians* to illude, or ſhifte of this ſacred teſtimony for the bleſſed Trinity? Could the *Arrians* doe more for themſelues, or their owne cauſe? So he. Shewing alſo the like boldnes, and impiety in that he goeth about to weaken the Authority of *Michæas* the Prophet, vſed by all ancient Fathers for the proofe of Chriſtes Godhead, where he ſaith, *Et egreſſus eius ab initio à diebus æternitatis*, and his going forth is from the beginning from the dayes of eternity; which words *Caluin*, though he cannot but grant for the euidēcy therof, to appertaine to the diuinity of Chriſt, yet doth he diuert the Prophetes meaning to a farre different ſenſe, and ſaith: *Hic eſt ſimplex ſenſus, ſcio quoſdam inſiſtere pertinaciùs, quod hic loquatur Propheta de æterna eſſentia Chriſti &c.* This is the ſimple ſenſe and meaning of the Prophet, albeit I know that ſome doe more obſtinatly contend, that the

8. example Eſa. 6. Pag. 42.

** Senī'em & venerandā canitiem petulanter vellicat.*

9. example Mich. 5.

„ the Prophet ſpeaketh heere of the eternall eſſence of
„ Chriſt: and for my part, though I doe willingly ac-
„ knowledge, that the diuinity of Chriſt is heere pro-
„ ued; yet for that we ſhall neuer get the Iewes to con-
„ feſſe it, I would rather ſimply take the wordes of the
„ Prophet as they ſound. So he. And note heere his
„ good reaſon (ſaith *Hunnius*) for that becauſe the Ie-
„ wes will not be brought to confeſſe the truth of this
„ text, *Caluin* himſelf will diſſemble it alſo, and peruert
„ the Scriptures to another meaning to pleaſe them. Is
„ not this wickedly to betray the cauſe of Chriſtians?
And is not this ſecretly to collude with the aduerſa-
ries? Is not this by diſsimulation to weakē our owne
forces in fauour of the enemies? But herof yow ſhall
ſee more in that which enſueth.

Out of the new Teſtament. §. 2.

87. AND with theſe places and ſome other the ſaid Doctor endeth his diſcourſe for corrupting of the Scriptures of the old Teſtament, in fauour of Iewes and Arrians, & paſſeth to the new, ſhewing Caluin no leſſe to fauour them both therin, then in the other, but rather much more. And firſt he alledgeth that moſt excellent place of *S. Iohns* Ghoſpel before mentioned, *Ego & Pater vnum ſumus*, I and my Father are one, which teſtimony al ancient Fathers, without exception, did vrge againſt the Arrians, as an inuincible bulwark to proue the vnity of Godhead in Chriſt with his Father; But what ſaith Caluin? *Ego* (ſaith he) *& Pater vnum ſumus, abuſi ſunt hoc loco veteres, vt probarent Chriſtum eſſe Patri Homuſion neque enim Chriſtus de vnitate ſubſtantiæ diſputat, ſed de conſenſu, quem cum Patre habet &c.*

10. Example. Ioan. 10.

bet &c. The ancient writers did abuse this place, to proue ther by that Christ was of the same nature and substance with his Father, for that Christ did not dispute heere of the vnity of substance, but of the vnity only of consent betweene him, and his Father: which was the very answere and shift of *Arrius* himselfe and of the old Arrians, and is at this day (saith *Hunnius*) of the new Arrians in *Transiluania* and els where, to wit of *Franciscus, Dauid, Blandrata*, and others.

88. And so in like manner where in the 10. and 14. of *S. Iohn*, Christ our Sauiour repeateth oftentimes *Ego sum in Patre, & Pater in me*, I am in my Father, and my Father in me, which was another great bulwarke of ancient Christianity against Arrians, *Caluin* ouerthroweth it thus: *Non hic* (saith he) *de essentia vnitate sermo habetur &c.* Heere is not any speach of vnity of essence betweene the Father and the Sonne, but only of the manifestation of Gods power in the person of Christ. And againe in another place: *Non ad diuinam Christi essentiam refero, sed ad modum reuelationis*: I doe not referre those wordes to the diuine nature of Christ, but to the manner of reuelation, which were also the Answeres of old Arrians, and are at this day of the new.

11. Exãple. Ioan. 10. & 14.

Hun. p. 53.

Comm. in c. 14. Ioan.

89. And finally not to be tedious, I passe ouer many other examples, as that *Ioan.* 17. in Christes speach to his Father: *That my disciples may be one, as we are one.* And againe: *That all may be one as thou Father art in me, and I in thee*, which ancient Doctors did interpret to signify the naturall vnity of Christ in Godhead with his Father. But what saith Caluin? *Multi ex Patribus* (saith he) *interpretati sunt Christum vnum esse cum Patre &c.* Many of the Fathers haue so interpreted these wordes, as though they proued that Christ is one with his Father for that he is eternall God, but their contention with the Arrians drew them violently to this, that they should

12. Exãple Ioan. 17.

Pag. 45.

should wrest broken sentences to a wronge sense. The like he writeth of that excellent place of *S. Iohn* in his first Epistle: *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cœlo &c. There are three in heauen that giue testimony, the Father, the word, and the holy Ghost, and these three are one*, which Catholike Deuines haue euer vnderstood of the naturall vnity of the three persons in the blessed Trinity, against the Arrians. But what saith *Caluin* on their side? *Quod dicit tres esse vnum, ad essentiam non refertur, sed ad consensum potius*: In that *S. Iohn* saith these three to be one, is not referred to their vnity of nature and essence, but rather to the vnity of their will, or consent. And will yow say now that *Caluin* is not worthy to haue his fee of the Arrians? Or will *Thomas Morton* say still that our malignant Doctors doe wrongfully accuse him?

13. Exãple. 1. Ioan. 5.

Pag. 59. *Quis non videt* (saith *Hunnius*) *diabolum per acutum suum instrumẽtum &c.* Who doth not see that the diuell by this
» sharpe instrument of his, doth goe about to disarme
» Christians, and arme the enemies of the blessed Tri-
» nity? For if these should aske vs, what testimonies we
» haue, what proose of Christes vnity in Godhead with
» his Father, we haue none left, *Vniuersa per aleatoriam*
» *istam quiduis eludendi versutiam è manibus excutiuntur*: All
» are stroken out of our handes by this dicing-deceipt
» of deluding any thing that is in Scripture for that
» purpose. But D. *Hunnius* goeth forward.

90. The like Comment maketh *Caluin* vpon those wordes of *S. Paul* to the *Colossians cap.* 1. where the Apostle calleth Christ *Imaginem Dei inuisibilis*, the image of God inuisible, and those other to the *Hebrewes c.* 1. *Qui est splendor gloriæ, & expressa imago substantiæ illius*: Who is the splendor of his glory, and the expresse image of his substance, where manifestly the Apostle doth affirme the deity of Christ, and the ancient Fathers out of the same wordes after him against the Arrians, and namely *S. Chrysostome* at large, what euasion thinke

14 Exãple. Colos. 1.

Pag. 61.

Hebr. 1.

thinke yow will *Iohn Caluin* teach the Arrians heere? Yow ſhall heare him in his owne wordes: *Scio* (ſaith he) *qualiter veteres exponere ſoleant, quia enim certamen habebant cum Arrianis &c.* I know how the ancient Fathers are wont to expound theſe wordes, for that they hauing combate with the *Arrians*, doe vrge the equality, and conſubſtantiality of God the Sonne with his Father, out of theſe places; but in the meane ſpace they hold their peace in that which is the principall, to wit, how God the Father doth exhibite himſelfe to be knowne to vs in Chriſt. And as for *Chryſoſtome*, who placeth all his ground in the word *Image*, while he ſtriueth to proue therby that a creature can not be the image of God the Creator, it is tooto weak &c. So he. Pag. 62.63.

91. And now (ſaith *Doctor Hunnius*) what way can be more effectuall then this to ouerthrow Chriſtian Religion, and bring in Arrianiſme? Or what place or text of Scripture remaineth now in force againſt the Iewes, and Arrians for defence of Chriſtes diuinity, if *Caluins* cenſure be admitted againſt all thoſe that haue byn cited? It is euident (ſaith he) *hoc genus eludendi Scripturas quo Caluinus vtitur, exoptatißimum diabolo adminiculum eſſe &c.* that this kind of eluding Scriptures vſed by *Caluin*, is the moſt deſired help for the diuell, that can be wiſhed, to ſhake the credit of one authority after another in mens hartes, vntill, before they be aware, they become Arrians. Thus *Hunnius*, who both for that he is a learned man, a Reader of Deuinity, a Proteſtant, & proueth all that he ſaith out of *Caluins* owne wordes, ought (me thinks) to be of great force againſt him, or at leaſtwiſe with all others, to looke well about them, how they belieue either him or his. Pag. 187.

About corrupting and eluding of Propheſyes. §. 3.

Pag.6. 92. AND this is now for the firſt Part of his booke, but in this ſecond about the predictions and Propheſies of Chriſt and Chriſtian Religion, he ſaith he hath much more to produce againſt *Caluin* for his foule corruptions, *Quibus illuſtriſſima vaticinia Prophetarum de Meſsia Iudaicis peruerſionibus inuoluit*, wherby he hath with his Iudaicall peruerſities obſcured the moſt notorious and cleere predictions of Prophets about the Meſsias, or Sauiour of the world. In which expoſitions or rather corruptions of his *non modò* (ſaith he) *Scriptorum Eccleſiaſticorum veterum & recentiorum pias interpretationes altiſsimè deſpexit & irriſit; ſed in nonnullis ipſorummet Euangeliſtarum Apoſtolorumq; Sacroſanctas explicationes nequiter illudere non eſt reueritus, quod niſi ad oculum demonſtrauero, præſertim vbi ad illa vaticinia Prophetarum deuenero, nolim ego mihi vlla vnquam in re poſtea fidem adhiberi.* He doth not only moſt haughtely deſpiſe the Godly interpretations of all ancient and moderne Eccleſiaſticall writers, but in diuers thinges alſo he was not afraid wickedly to elude the holy explications of the Euangeliſtes and Apoſtles themſelues, which except I ſhall demonſtrate vnto the eye, eſpecially when I come to examine the predictions of Prophetes, I will neuer haue any man to giue me credit afterward. So confidently ſpeaketh *Doctor Hunnius* of *Caluins* wickednes in this behalf, ſo to weaken and eneruate the teſtimonies of Scripture that make for Chriſt, *vt omnem ad probandum vim atque valorem amittant penitus*, ſaith he, that therby they wholy looſe al their force & value to proue

proue any thing. And what can be more impious & perilous then this?

93. It would be to long to runne ouer the Prophe-ſies by him alledged as peruerted by *Caluin*, though it were with the ſame breuity that we haue peruſed the teſtimonies of Scripture before mentioned (for I muſt remẽber that all muſt goe within a part of one Chap-ter:) yet ſome few lines I muſt beſtow therin for exã-ples ſake, therby to leaue a gheſſe to the Reader for the reſt which I muſt omit. Firſt then in the very firſt promiſe of all made *Gen.*3. for comming of the *Meßias*, where God ſaid to the ſerpẽt: *I ſhall put emnity betweene thee and the woman, and betweene thy ſeed and her ſeed, ſhee ſhall crush thy head, and thou ſhalt lay wait at her heele*, which all Chriſtian writers from the beginning, yea the A-poſtles and Prophetes before them, did vnderſtand of the emnity to be betweene the diuell and Chriſt the womans ſeed; but this doth *Caluin* wholy euacuate, & turne to a meere mockery, interpreting it to be meant only of the naturall hatred that is betweene men and ſerpents, and that as ſerpents ſeeke to ſting men, ſo men indeauour euery where to kil ſerpents; by which interpretation, is eluded (ſaith *Doctor Hunnius*) the firſt foundation of all Chriſtian faith, wherby the Fathers of the old Teſtament did ſuſtaine themſelues. And then he turneth himſelf to *S. Paul*, ſhewing how *Cal-uin* doth condemne his expoſition of abſurdity, about the ſaid ſeed of the woman mentioned both heere, & in the other promiſe to *Abraham*, *In thy ſeed all nations ſhalbe bleſſed*, in which places *Caluin* (ſaith *Hunnius*) ex-preſſely againſt *S. Paul* to the *Galat.* will haue it vnder-ſtood *ſeedes* in the plurall number, and not *ſeed*: *Miror hominis proiectam confidentiam: Vbi frons negantis id quod affir-mat Paulus? &c.* I doe wonder at the deſperate preſump-tion of this man; where is *Caluins* forehead, in denying that which *S. Paul* doth affirme, and affirming that

15. Exãple. Gen.3.

Caluinus Com. in c. 3. Geneſis.

Pag.71.

Cal. Com. in 3. ad Galatas.

Pag.74.

which *S Paul* doth ſo earneſtly refute?

94. Then paſſeth he to another propheſy out of *Ieremy* concerning Chriſtes natiuity, where is ſaid; *God ſhall create a new thing vpon the earth, a woman ſhall incloſe a man*, which being vnderſtood by all ancient writers (ſaith *Hunnius*) of the bleſſed virgin Mary, and her ſacred fruit of the wombe, that in reſpect of the perfection, which he had by his deity, euen in the wombe, was a perfect man: but *Caluin* ſcoffeth therat. *Chriſtiani* (ſaith he) *ferè vno conſenſu &c.* Chriſtians almoſt with one conſent haue interpreted this Propheſy of *Mary* the virgin, and they were moued therunto by the name of a miracle, and therupon perhaps they ſnatched too greedily at thoſe thinges that might ſeeme to make for the miſtery of our ſaluation, ſaying, that Chriſt was both an infant and a man, for that he was full of diuine fortitude in his Mothers wombe, albeit according to his fleſh he did grow in ſtature, in wiſedome, and vertue; *Meritò hoc ridetur a Iudæis*, but this is worthily laughed at by the Iewes, and further, ſaith he, the true meaning of the Prophet is only that in the warres betweene the *Chaldees* and the *Iewes*, the Iewiſh women ſhalbe ſtrõger then the *Chaldean* men, and bring them into ſtraights, *redigent fœminæ viros in anguſtias*, ſaith he, women ſhall driue men into ſtraightes. And is not this a good Iewiſh Aduocate? Could any Infidell ſpeake more cõtẽptuouſly of our prooſes?

16. Exãple Hier. 31.

Pag. 75.

95. From this he ſteppeth to the fourth Propheſy of *Aggeus* about the comming of Chriſt; *Mouebo omnes gentes, & veniet deſideratus cunctis gentibus, & implebo domum iſtam gloria &c.* I will moue all nations, and the deſired of all nations ſhall come, and I ſhall repleniſh this houſe with glory; which Propheſy being ſo cleere, & ſo generally receaued by all Chriſtians as ſignifying the glory of Chriſt, and of the Chriſtian Church that *Caluin* could not for ſhame deny it; yet ſhall yow ſee

17. Exãple. Agg. 2.

Pag. 81.

how

how he doth ſeeke to eneruate, and make void the ſame. This Propheſy (ſaith he) of the deſired of all Nations may be vnderſtood two wayes: firſt that all Nations ſhall come and bring with them whatſoeuer precious thinges they haue: *Nam Hebræi deſiderium vocant quicquid habetur in precio, vt diuitias, honores &c.* For that the Hebrewes doe call *deſire* or *deſired*, whatſoeuer is much eſteemed, as riches, honour and the like; *Sed poſſumus etiam intelligere de Chriſto &c.* But yet we may alſo vuderſtand it of Chriſt &c. *Sed ſimplicior ſenſus eſt ille quem iam retuli*, but the more ſimple, plaine, or naturall ſenſe, is that which I haue now related, that Nations ſhall come with all their riches &c. And heere alſo doth not *Caluin* play well his part? By this yow may know him in all the reſt, and yet ſhall wee ſet downe one example more and ſo end.

96. And this ſhall be that famous and moſt excellent Propheſy of Chriſtes Fore-runner *S. Iohn Baptiſt* moſt perſpicuouſly vttered by the Prophet *Eſay* in his fourtith Chapter, and in theſe wordes: *Vox clamantis in deſerto parate viam Domini &c.* A voice of a Crier in the deſert, prepare the way of our Lord, make right the pathes of our God: which wordes both *S. Matthew*, *S. Marke*, and *S. Luke*, at large doe expound to haue byn vnderſtood of *S. Iohn Baptiſt* preaching in the deſert of *Iury* and warning the Iewes to prepare the way of the *Meßias*: all which this miſerable man, in fauour of the Iewes, endeauoreth to elude and euacuate, applying the ſame wholy to another prophane purpoſe, affirming, firſt that by the voice of a *Cryer*, is not vnderſtood any particuler man as *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, but all Prophetes in generall: and then by the *deſert*, he vnderſtandeth not that deſert of *Iury* wherin *S. Iohn* did preach, but metaphorically the *deſert of deſolatiõ* to haue byn meant by *Eſay*, when the people were in the captiuity of *Babilon*; and thirdly more fully to ouerthrow

18 Exãple. Iſa 40.

the whole Propheſy, he asketh this queſtion: *Quos compellat iſta vox, an fideles? minimè. Sed Cyrum, Perſas & Medos.* To whome doth this voice of the Cryer in the deſert ſpeake, vnto faithfull people? No, not at all. But only vnto King *Cyrus*, and to the *Perſians* & *Medes*, that held the people of *Iſrael* in captiuity. So he. And how greatly then were deceaued the three Euangeliſtes before mentioned, that ſo earneſtly ſet forth vnto vs the comfort of this Propheſy, fulfilled in *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, which *Caluin* now hath endeauored to take from vs, wherupon *Doctor Hunnius* inferreth theſe wordes: *Quis piæ mentis hæc legens & audiens temperare ſibi poteſt &c.*

Pag. 91.

„ What man of pious mind that ſhall read or hear theſe
„ thinges, can ſo ouer rule himſelf, as not to hate with a
„ perfect hatred, as the Prophet ſpeaketh, yea and deteſt
„ this architect of Iewiſh deceipts, that is not affraide
„ to hold vp his finger againſt the interpretations of the
„ Sacred Euangeliſtes themſelues. So he.

97. But to come to an end, I will leaue nineteene or twenty more Propheſies vndiſcuſſed, to wit three that remaine of this firſt point about the comming and natiuity of Chriſt, eight that did foretel his ſacred paſſion and particulers therof, foure of his reſurrection, and foure or fiue more of his miraculous aſcenſion, & ſitting on the right hand of God; all which doth *Iohn Caluin* with metaphoricall and malicious interpretations weaken, elude, ouerthrow, & take from vs; yea though the Euangeliſtes & Apoſtles themſelues haue expreſſely expounded them literally to appertaine to Chriſt: which this *Doctor Hunnius* doth notably & ſubſtantially proue out of *Caluins* owne wordes throughout this breif, but iudicious booke of his, making many exclamations againſt *Caluins* impiety therin, eſpecially in one place, where ſeeing the mã endeauoreth to take from vs that whole Pſalme, *Deus Deus meus*, which ſetteth downe moſt of the particulers of Chriſtes

The corruption of 20. Propheſies more omitted for breuities ſake.

Pſal. 22.

Chriſtes paſsion, as the percing of his feet and handes, deuiding of his garments, & other ſuch points, which the Euangeliſts and Apoſtles themſelues doe apply literally to our Sauiour, and this man only in a metaphoricall ſenſe to King *Dauid*; yea ſaying further that the Euangeliſtes did draw thinges *intempeſtiuè ad præſentem cauſam*, out of ſeaſon to the preſent cauſe of Chriſt, *Et quòd dum negligunt ſenſum metaphoricum a natiuo ſenſu diſcedunt*, And whiles they did neglect *Caluins* metaphoricall ſenſe, they departed from the true naturall ſenſe of the Prophet: *Doctor Hunnius* (I ſay) vpon theſe & other like inſolences, breaketh out into theſe wordes, that he cannot ſufficiently deteſt *extremam Caluini impietatem, cum intolerabili faſtu coniunctam, quo ſe ſuper ſanctiſſimos Dei ſeruos, Euangeliſtas, & Apoſtolos, quaſi illorum cenſor effert*, that extreame impiety of *Caluin*, ioyned with intolerable pride, wherby he ſetteth himſelf aboue the moſt holy ſeruantes of God, the Euangeliſtes, and Apoſtles, as their Cenſurer: and therfore after he had demonſtrated this pride and impiety in all the reſt of the Propheſies by him peruerted, drawing towardes the end, he concludeth thus: *Quapropter vt receptui canam, detectum ſatis ſuperq; iudico Angelum illum tenebrarum Iohannem Caluinum &c.*

Pag.135.

Pag.136.

The extreme impiety and pride of Caluin according to D.Hunn.

Pag.184.

98. Wherfore that I may now (ſaith he) retire my ſelf, I doe iudge that Angell of darknes *Iohn Caluin* to be ſufficiently, and more then ſufficiently diſcouered, who being raiſed from the pit of hell, to the peruerting of mankinde, hath partly by his deteſtable deſire of wreſting Scriptures, and ouerthrowing the Bulwarkes of Chriſtian Religion, which it hath againſt Iewes and Arrians; partly alſo by his impious pen againſt the holy and ſacred Maieſty of *Ieſus Nazarenus* now exalted in heauen; partly alſo by his peruerſe doctrine of the Sacrament, and horrible monſtrous paradoxes of his abſolute predeſtination; By all theſe meanes

» meanes (I say) he hath obiscured in these our later
» dayes, no small part of the light and sunne of Godes
» truth, & drawne with him a great number of starres,
» as the Apocalips saith, into the bottomeles pit of eter-
» nall damnatiõ. God euerlasting out of his mercy, signe
his seruantes that they be not corrupted with this pe-
stilent plague of *Calumian* seducement, and bring back
againe vnto Iesus Christ, the true Pastour of their
soules, those that are seduced by them, that they pe-
» rish not in their errour, but be saued eternally with all
» those that faithfully loue God Amen. And this I had
» (saith he) to admonish the Church of God, of the most
» wicked deceiptes of *Iohn Caluin*. And if *Doctor Pareus*
» will answere any thing to this, let him not entertaine
» himselfe in generall speech only, as his people are
» wont to doe, but come to particulers &c. So *Hunnius*.

D. Hunnius protestation and praier against Caluinistes.

99. And now *M. Morton*, will yow say that all this also, which *Doctor Hunnius* hath brought against *Caluin* about furthering of Iudaisme and Arrianisme is out of the spirit only of opposition and contradiction, as yow shifted of the Deane and Colledge of *Tubinga*, alledged before by your Aduersary? Will yow answere in like manner, *it is not much to be regarded what he saith*, seeing he bringeth so many great and substantiall proofes for the same out of *M. Caluins* confessed workes and wrytinges? Or will yow say, as yow said before, *that their iudgment hath byn depraued by our malignant Doctors?* seeing that yow haue heard this your owne *Doctor Hunnius* speake in his owne language and sense so resolutly and earnestly against *Caluin* and *Caluinistes*? If you dare not say this again enow, then was it but a shift and dissimulation before: and if yow should say it againe now, yow would be laughed at by all men. And though yow doe not; yet euery wise man will consider, with what truth or ground yow said it before, to wit, for a meere shift, not vnderstanding or

The conclusion to M. Mortõ.

thinking,

thinking, as yow ſpeake. And conforme to that will they eſteem of the reſt, which yow ſay or write, without further ground of reall ſubſtance, but only that yow muſt ſay ſomewhat, and that it ſerueth for your purpoſe to ſpeake it for the preſent. But now ſhall we returne to the place & page of your Reply, from whence we went forth in this digreſsiō about *Caluin*.

100. Yow complaine in the ſaid place, as before hath byn ſhewed, of the charge of Arrianiſme laid falſly vpon *Caluin, by our Ieſuites*, as yow ſay, and this for one only ſpeech of his where he ſaith; *That the Father is by a kinde of excellency God*, which yow ſay both in ſpeech and ſenſe, is moſt orthodoxall, and agreeing with the tenour of holy writ, and iudgment of all ancient Fathers, *as our owne learned Ieſuites confeſſe, and doe produce* (ſay yow) *for their authority an inqueſt of Fathers to free Caluin in this point*, which Fathers vpon thoſe wordes of *S. Iohns* Ghoſpell, *my Father is greater then I*, doe affirme that the Father is greater, *not in ſubſtance and being, but by reaſon of birth and begetting*, for which yow alledge *Cardinall Tolet* & *Maldonate*, both Ieſuites, in their commentaries vpon *S. Iohns* Ghoſpell.

The Returne to the Reply. Pag. 17.

101. But this Syr by your leaue, ſuppoſing al were ſo, doth not free *Caluin* in this point of Arrianiſme: for that he is otherwiſe manifoldly conuinced, as now yow haue heard. And ſecōdly, for this ſole point or ſentēce heere mentioned, albeit the two forenamed Ieſuites doe cite diuers ancient Fathers, that doe hold thoſe wordes of Chriſt, *My Father is greater then I*, are true, not only in reſpect of his humanity, but alſo in a certaine ſort, as he is God, to wit, that betweene thoſe perſonall relations of Father and Sonne, Begetter and Begotten, in the bleſſed Trinity, there ariſeth a more honourable reſpect out of the former, then of the later; yet doth not this make that in the Godhead it ſelf, the Father is more excellent then the Sonne, or that by

In vvhat ſenſe ancient Fathers doe vnderſtād the vvordes *My Father is greater then I* to be vnderſtood alſo in a certaine ſorte as Chriſt vvas God, and the ſecond perſon in Trinity.

excellency he is God, or that the name of God by a certaine excellency doth only belõg vnto him, as *Caluin* is accuſed to ſay, which in all ſenſible conſtruction muſt import, that the Sonne is inferiour vnto him in ſubſtance of Godhead, which is a cheif point of *Arrianiſme* wheron the old *Arrians* did principally ſtand, in all their diſputes againſt Catholickes.

102. And wheras T. M. for his laſt defenſe of *Caluin* ſaith, that he was ſo farre of from *Arrianiſme*, that our owne *Bellarmine* doth acknowledge that *Caluin did impugne the doctrine of the Arrians*, in this alſo, as in all the reſt, he vſeth great fraud. For firſt *Bellarmine* hath not this affirmatiue propoſition, as heere is ſet downe, *Caluin did impugne the doctrine of the Arrians*; but only he confeſſeth that *Caluin* and other Sectaries, who out of their wicked doctrine cõſenting with the old *Arrians* haue giuen occaſion to the offspring of new *Arrians* in our dayes, doe notwithſtanding write bookes againſt them, as *Caluin* did; which thing may ariſe vpon diuers occaſions, concerning either their perſons or ſect.

Hovv and vvhether Caluin did impugne the Arrians.

Bellarmins wordes are theſe: *Albeit Luther, Melanchthon, Caluin and their like doe hold Arrius for an Heretick; yet can they not deny but that themſelues in their writinges did ſow the ſeedes of this errour, from whence afterwardes ſprong vp theſe new Arrians, which they themſelues impugne:* So as *Bellarmine* doth not ſpeake in this place particularly of *Caluins* impugning all the doctrine of *Arrians*, as heere this man would ſeeme to impoſe vpon him, citing falſly this ſentence out of him: *Arrianos Caluinus impugnauit*, and no more; but that he and other Sectaries of our dayes would ſeeme in ſome thinges to impugne thẽ, wheras in other thinges they held with them. For ſo preſently in the very next wordes doth *Bellarmine* expreſly declare himſelf, where hauing reduced the Hereſies of *Arrius* to two heades, ſaith, that the former ſort are held publickly by the new *Arrians* of our dayes,

Bellar. de notis Eccleſiæ c. 9.

wherof

wherof the ſeedes were ſowne by *Caluin* and others: but the ſecond ſort are held expreſſely by *Caluin* and other moderne Sectaries, *Alterum errorem Arrianorum docent omnes huius temporis Hæretici* ſaith he. So as in this alſo there is notable fraudulent dealing of T. M. as yow ſee; yea nothing almoſt commeth from him without fraude.

103. But as for this bragge of his & his fellows that *Caluin* did write diuers books againſt the new *Arrians*, and *Trinitarians* of our time, as namely againſt *Seruetus*, *Gentilis*, *Alciatus*, *Blandrata* and others, *Doctor Hunnius* that hath read their workes & his, can beſt make anſwere, & decide the matter, who ſaith: *Pridem & hoc inclaruit in orbe Chriſtiano, quibus ex Scholis & Eccleſiis ipſa illa immania portenta prodierint.* It is now well knowne in the Chriſtian world, out of what ſchooles and Churches thoſe foule monſters (*the new Arrians & Trinitarians*) haue proceeded, that is to ſay, from the Caluiniſtes &c. And wheras (ſaith he) it is vaunted that *Caluin* did write againſt theſe Heretickes, wee deny not but that therin he did well, albeit in truth he gaue occaſion to the diuell by his manner of dealing, to raiſe vp no ſmall number of enemies againſt the bleſſed Trinity, and conſequently he did no otherwiſe, then if one hauing holpen ſome to ſet fire on a houſe, ſhould after the flame therof waxeth boyſterous, help other men alſo for extinguiſhing or reſtrayning the ſame. So *Hunnius*: who finally concludeth with this prayer: *Dominus Ieſus Satanam ſub pedes noſtros conterat citò, & a lue Caluiniſtica clementer liberet Eccleſiam ſuam. Amen.* Our Lord Ieſus cruſh Satan quickly vnder our feet, and of his clemency deliuer his Church from the infection of *Caluiniſtes*. Thus he, and with this praier he endeth his booke.

Pag. 187.

D. Hunn. opinion about Caluins vvriting againſt Arrians.

Pag. 190.

Pag. 193.

104. And now if this man had byn a Papiſt, great exceptions no doubt would be taken againſt him; but being a brother of the ſame Ghoſpell, & one of thoſe

whome *M. Sutcliffe M. V Villet* and all other Proteſtant-writers at this day (yea *Syr Edward Cooke* alſo in his arraignements) doe hold to be a true ſeruant of God, & a member of the true Church being of the Lutheran ſect, I doe not ſee why it ſhould not moue thē much and all other that haue care of their ſoules to looke vnto themſelues, when they ſee the Caluinian ſect ſo earneſtly condemned in their firſt Authors, as heere it is in *Iohn Caluin*, by ſo learned and famous a man as *Doctor Hunnius* is eſteemed to be. And with this I will end this Chapter leauing only theſe few ponderations following vpon the whole ſubiect therof.

Certaine ponderations vpon the Premiſſes. §. 4.

105. AND for that the matter is, or may be of ſingular importance for him that wil make due reflection and profit his ſoule therby, I am induced to ſuggeſt to the Readers conſideration, and lay before the eye of his memory theſe few pointes enſuing.

1. Ponderation. Firſt what a horrible thing it is, that ſuch a man, and ſo learned as *M. Caluin* is held to be, and togeather ſo great a ſeruant of God, as his followers eſteeme him, ſhould be ſo groſſely, and damnably deceaued in the expoſition of Scripture, as in ſo many places as heere hath byn ſet downe, and others named by me, though not laid forth in particuler, his expoſition ſhould ſo manifeſtly fauour infidelity, Iudaiſme & Arrian Hereſy, and vtterly ouerthrow the foundations of Chriſtian faith: which expoſitions either did proceed of ignorance in him, (and then he might be deceiued in other matters alſo) or of impiety, which were farre

worſe,

worſe,or of pride,and deſire to cõtradict the ancient Fathers (yea Apoſtles and Euangeliſtes themſelues,) which muſt needes be graunted to be a diabolicall ſpirit, or finally of an appetite to weaken the ancient foundatiõs of Chriſtianity, ſo as he might plant what new Religion he would,which no man can but deteſt and abhorre.

106. And out of this ponderation I gather another of no leſſe cõſequence, which is,how little aſſurance, and how ſmall ground a man may haue, that truth is on his ſide by the vaunt of Scriptures,which all ſectaries generally doe vſe. For if *Iohn Caluin*, the head of ſo great a Sect as doth follow him, ſo ſingularly indued with learning, and ſpirit aboue the reſt, as he is preſumed, did erre ſo fouly in the expoſition of ſo many weighty paſſages of Scripture, which concerne ſo high pointes of our Saluation,to wit,the Godhead & Maieſty of Chriſt,his equality with his Father,and other like pointes as yow haue heard, what may be expected of inferiour men, or what certainty can there be of their true interpretation,though neuer ſo much they quote places of Scripture,as all Sectes & Sectaries are wonte to doe. For that all the importance cõſiſting in the true ſenſe,no man can be aſſured therof, that relieth vpon any priuate mans iudgment whatſoeuer: and for ſo much as we haue ſeene *M. Iohn Caluin* ſo groſſely to erre about theſe principall points of Chriſtes diuinity,wreſting them openly from their true and naturall ſenſe, what ſuerty can I haue to belieue him in his expoſitions of other Scripturs,againſt the reall preſence, the maſſe,prayer for the dead, purgatory, & like points now in cõtrouerſy; ſeing that he may be as wel deceiued in theſe,as he was in the other? 2. Ponderation.

107. Thirdly I doe gather out of this, that only Catholicke men, either learned or vnlearned, are happy in this behalfe,and in a ſure way, that admit only and 3. Ponderation.

belieue that sense and interpretation of holy Scriptures, which is conforme to the old ancient Fathers, who receaued the same againe of their Fathers, and precedent Bishops, Doctors and teachers in the Catholicke Church, & so conserued the same from time to time without adhering to any that were not conforme therunto, euen from the first primitiue Church vnto our dayes, examining and conferring the same in Councels, Synodes, Schooles, Lectures, Sermons, Treatises, and other like occasions with the said gerall consent and vniforme iudgment of Fathers and ancestours, & approbation of the Church, and chiefe Pastors and guides therof from time to time, vnto whome our Sauiour hath expresly promised the assistance of his holy spirit for directing the said Church, and all particuler men therin that will, as they should doe, obediently follow their direction.

4. Ponderation. 108. Fourthly I doe consider that this great Doctor, and learned Professor of Deuinity among the Lutheran sect in Germany, and that in *VVittemberg* their chiefe Vniuersity (*Doctor Hunnius*) doth condemne *Iohn Caluin* of foure great impieties; the one of wilfull corrupting of Scriptures, and that in principall poinres of our faith, and in fauour of *Iewes* and *Arrians*, as yow haue heard; the second of malice against the Maiesty of Christ, and his consubstantiality with the Father; the third of wicked doctrine about Predestination; & the fourth of like wicked doctrine *De re Sacramentaria*, concerning the Sacraments, but especially that of the *Reall presence*; wheras if any one of these foure heades should be true (as he affirmeth and proueth them all to be) it must needes be euerlasting damnation to him, and his followers: and if they be not true, it were great and intollerable impiety in *Hunnius*, to auerre them so earnestly as he doth. But howsoeuer it be, it seemeth impossible, that he and *Iohn Caluin* can be sa-

1. Pag. 185. 2. 3. 4.

ued

ued togeather, or be of one Church and faith, as our Engliſh Proteſtantes would haue them; and yet doe both of them band againſt the Catholicke, & therby doe well ſhew, that a man may erre, and goe amiſſe many wayes, but that there is but one way to goe right, ſundry pathes to perdition, but one only to ſaluation. God open our eyes to ſee it, and ſtrengthen our willes to follow it, for that Hereſy is endleſſe, and leadeth into inextricable labyrinthes of eternall perdition.

109. The fifth & laſt ponderation ſhalbe cõcerning *M. Morton* in particuler, whoſe manner of proceeding hauing byn diſcouered throughout this whole Chapter, to be founded principally in fraud and deceiptfull dealing with the Authors alledged by him, and conuinced in ſo many places as yow haue ſeene of witting and willing falſhood, in ſuch ſort as by no way of errour, ignorance, defence, expoſition, or interpretation can probably be excuſed, it may be conſidered how vnfit a man he is to take vpon him, with ſuch eagerneſſe, as he doth, to inueigh and ſtorme againſt Equiuocation, which is nothing els but a meane by diuerſion of ſpeech to auoid the neceſsity of making a lye, which whoſoeuer hath no ſcruple or repugnãce of conſcience to doe, (as is euident heere by many examples, that *M. Morton* hath not) he hath no need at all of the refuge of Equiuocation, and ſo may inueigh againſt it at his pleaſure, and proteſt euery where as he doth, *that he hateth in his hart both Equiuocatours and Equiuocation*, for that in deed they ſerue him to no vſe, he being determined vpon the other. 5. Ponderation.

110. But yet for that he will needes enter into this combat alſo againſt the doctrine of Equiuocation, & hath taken vpon him to write a ſeuerall confutation of a certaine Treatiſe that went in written hand, in defence of that doctrine, in certaine vrgent caſes, and beſides

beſides this, will needes lay this for a foundation, *why Catholicke people are not to be truſted or tolerated in a Proteſtant Common-wealth*; I ſhall now paſſe to examine this matter with him, wherin I doubt not but I ſhall finde him the ſame man for truth & ſincerity, as in the precedent pointes, and no leſſe grounded in his proofes, then hitherto yow haue ſeene: only he hath this aduantage more now then he had in the other, for that by no means I could hitherto come to ſee the Treatiſe which he refuteth, & therby ſhall not be able to conuince him ſo apparently of falſhood and fraudulent ſhiftes in his citations out of that Treatiſe, which yet I aſſure my ſelf are no more ſincere then they were in the former; yea I haue many euident coniectures that they are far worſe, and ſo much the more, by how much leſſe feare he hath that any ſuch copies ſhall come to my handes, they hauing taken, as is thought, the ſole originall it ſelf. And thus much by way of preamble, now to the matter it ſelf.

OF

OF THE SECOND GENERALL POINT OF CALVMNIATION,

Set forth againſt Catholickes by *Thomas Morton*:

CONCERNING EQVIVOCATION,

VVhich is reduced to certaine particuler conſiderations for better diſcuſsion therof.

CHAP. VII.

AS in the former point now handled, about reiecting the iniurious charge of diſobedient and Rebellious minds in Catholiks, I thought it beſt to ſeparate the queſtion from the common outcries of ſlaunderous and falſe accuſing tongues, vnto ſome more euident and temperate ſtate of triall, by laying downe a demonſtration of factes, practice, and exerciſe of both partes in that behalfe, wherby euery

man of meaneſt capacity and vnderſtanding, may by experimentall euidence ſee, and diſcerne the reall difference betweene Proteſtant and Catholicke ſpirits in that behalfe: So heere in this ſecond point of this Miniſters ſlaunders and Calumniations, concerning Equiuocation, and intolerable iniuries caſt out by that occaſion againſt vs, as Fathers of lying, fauourers of falſhood, patrons of periury, and the like; I hold it neceſſary for better vnderſtanding of the whole controuerſy, and open iniuſtice offred therin vnto vs, to draw the matter from quarrelling and cauilling in wordes, vſed by our aduerſaries, to ſome more ſound, and ſerious conſiderations, wherby truth and falſhood may better be diſcerned: which conſiderations we ſhall heere with as much breuity as may be ſet downe in order.

The firſt Conſideration. §. 1.

1. About the peruerſity of our aduerſaries.

2. AND firſt of all, to the end the indifferent Reader may vnderſtand with what kind of aduerſaries we are to deale in this matter, I thinke it neceſſary for declaring their peruerſity, & preuenting ſome calumniations, to make a certaine breife proteſtation or explication heere, at the beginning, that we doe not take this defence of Equiuocation in hand, either for patronage of lying, as this New-diſcouered-falſe-Miniſter doth euery where moſt ſlaunderouſly inculcate, nor for that we delight in this art, or manner of euaſion by Equiuocation, though it be no lye at all; but rather doe allow, & like farre better of ſimple, plaine, and reſolute ſpeach in all Catholickes, concerning as well matters of ordinary conuerſation, as of their conſcience

ſcience & religion, eſpecially at this time, when God hath giuen them ſo ſinguler an occaſiõ to profeſſe the ſame to his great honour, and their owne euerlaſting good, and increaſe of merit: Yet for that perfection is one thing, and obligation is another, we may not binde mẽ to more, then Gods precept bindeth, which is neuer to lye, or vtter any vntruth. But as for the other of *Amphibologie*, doubtfull ſpeach, or Equiuocation, if law of nature, diuine, and humaine, doe in certaine caſes permit it vnto men, (as afterward ſhall be ſhewed) either for concealing of thinges ſecret, or for neceſſary defence of innocency, we may not without iniuſtice take that right from them, which by ſo many titles they may duely chalenge.

Hovv Equiuocation is defended.

3. It were greatly to be wiſhed by all good and peaceable men, that the moſt excellent forme of Chriſtian ſpeach preſcribed by our Sauiour, *Yea, Yea, No, No*, were vſed by all in common conuerſation, and no other; as alſo *Nolite iurare omnino*, ſweare not at all: but yet for that the infirmity of man is ſuch (ſaith *S. Auguſtine*) as one will hardly belieue an other without an oath, the Church of God hath alwayes ſo interpreted thoſe wordes of Chriſt, ſo as they take not all liberty of ſwearing from Chriſtians in neceſſary caſes, albeit perfect men would paſſe with the ſame. And this is *S. Auguſtines* reaſon in ſundry partes of his workes, and is tranſlated into the Canon law by *Gratian*, and conſequently alſo allowed by Popes and the ſea Apoſtolicke.

Matth.5.

4. And to the ſame effect appertaineth in like manner, that ſaying of the Apoſtle to the Corinthians: *Bonum eſt homini mulierem non tangere*: It were good that a man did not touch any woman at all, and ſo I doubt not but many good men in thoſe dayes obſerued his Counſell, as now alſo in the Catholike Church infinite doe: yet in reſpect of mans naturall infirmity, and

1. Cor. 7.

man of meaneſt capacity and vnderſtanding, may by experimentall euidence ſee, and diſcerne the reall difference betweene Proteſtant and Catholicke ſpirits in that behalfe: So heere in this ſecond point of this Miniſters ſlaunders and Calumniations, concerning Equiuocation, and intolerable iniuries caſt out by that occaſion againſt vs, as Fathers of lying, fauourers of falſhood, patrons of periury, and the like; I hold it neceſſary for better vnderſtanding of the whole controuerſy, and open iniuſtice offred therin vnto vs, to draw the matter from quarrelling and cauilling in wordes, vſed by our aduerſaries, to ſome more ſound, and ſerious conſiderations, wherby truth and falſhood may better be diſcerned: which conſiderations we ſhall heere with as much breuity as may be ſet downe in order.

The firſt Conſideration. §. 1.

1. About the peruerſity of our aduerſaries.

2. AND firſt of all, to the end the indifferent Reader may vnderſtand with what kind of aduerſaries we are to deale in this matter, I thinke it neceſſary for declaring their peruerſity, & preuenting ſome calumniations, to make a certaine breife proteſtation or explication heere, at the beginning, that we doe not take this defence of Equiuocation in hand, either for patronage of lying, as this New-diſcouered-falſe-Miniſter doth euery where moſt ſlaunderouſly inculcate, nor for that we delight in this art, or manner of euaſion by Equiuocation, though it be no lye at all; but rather doe allow, & like farre better of ſimple, plaine, and reſolute ſpeach in all Catholickes, concerning as well matters of ordinary conuerſation, as of their conſcience

ſcience & religion, eſpecially at this time, when God hath giuen them ſo ſinguler an occaſiõ to profeſſe the ſame to his great honour, and their owne euerlaſting good, and increaſe of merit: Yet for that perfection is one thing, and obligation is another, we may not binde mẽ to more, then Gods precept bindeth, which is neuer to lye, or vtter any vntruth. But as for the other of *Amphibologie*, doubtfull ſpeach, or Equiuocation, if law of nature, diuine, and humaine, doe in certaine caſes permit it vnto men, (as afterward ſhall be ſhewed) either for concealing of thinges ſecret, or for neceſſary defence of innocency, we may not without iniuſtice take that right from them, which by ſo many titles they may duely chalenge.

Hovv Equiuocation is defended.

3. It were greatly to be wiſhed by all good and peaceable men, that the moſt excellent forme of Chriſtian ſpeach preſcribed by our Sauiour, *Yea, Yea, No, No*, were vſed by all in common conuerſation, and no other; as alſo *Nolite iurare omnino*, ſweare not at all: but yet for that the infirmity of man is ſuch (ſaith *S. Auguſtine*) as one will hardly belieue an other without an oath, the Church of God hath alwayes ſo interpreted thoſe wordes of Chriſt, ſo as they take not all liberty of ſwearing from Chriſtians in neceſſary caſes, albeit perfect men would paſſe with the ſame. And this is *S. Auguſtines* reaſon in ſundry partes of his workes, and is tranſlated into the Canon law by *Gratian*, and conſequently alſo allowed by Popes and the ſea Apoſtolicke.

Matth.5.

4. And to the ſame effect appertaineth in like manner, that ſaying of the Apoſtle to the Corinthians: *Bonum eſt homini mulierem non tangere*: It were good that a man did not touch any woman at all, and ſo I doubt not but many good men in thoſe dayes obſerued his Counſell, as now alſo in the Catholike Church infinite doe: yet in reſpect of mans naturall infirmity, and

1. Cor. 7.

for auoiding fornication, as the same Apostle saith, euery man that will, and is at his owne choise (not hauing bound himself to any other state) is permitted to marry, and when he is maried it were more perfect not to make any diuorce at all, & so our Sauiour saith it was from the beginning: but yet in regard of the said humaine infirmity, it is permitted in certaine cases to vse that remedy of dismissing his wife.

Math.19.

5. And to the very same purpose may be referred that of the same Apostle to the same Corinthians, where he reprehendeth them sharpely for that they went to law one with an other, and this before infidel Iudges, yea they offred one another iniuries; whereas they should (saith he) haue suffred iniuries, rather then goe to law at all, and so he telleth them, and I doubt not but many good men among them did so: & yet for that he would not bind them to more then was of necessity, nor take from them the naturall and ciuill liberty, which iustice gaue them to try their cõtrouersies by law, when otherwise they could not agree, he permitted them to haue Iudges, so they were Christians; wherby is euident, that albeit good men desirous of perfection, and prepared to suffer iniuries, may liue without going to law, without swearing, without diuorcing their wiues, without Equiuocation or *Amphibology* in their speach or actions, vsing only *Yea, Yea*, and *No, No*: yet for that all men are not bound to this exactnesse, they are not to be condemned that vse their lawfull liberty heerin, without sinne, or offending God, and much lesse are any way to raile vpon them, as the Anabaptistes of our dayes doe vpon them that take any Oath, or goe to law at all; & as the old *Manichies* did vpon them that tooke wiues, or married for any cause; and as this Minister doth vpon all Catholikes for allowing Equiuocation or Amphibology in any case or sense whatsoeuer:

2.Cor.6.

Diuers things of perfection vvhich are not of necessity.

wheras

wheras he notwithstanding without Equiuocation or amphibology doth lye so ordinarily, & notoriously throughout his whole booke, as in parte yow haue seene before in the precedent Chapters,and are to behold more afterward.

6. Moreouer the iniquity of this Minister and his fellowes is seene in this; that wheras we hold that Equiuocation is no lye at all,nor can be (except it passe from the nature of Equiuocation as after shall be shewed:) these fellowes will needes suppose that wee graunt it to be a lye, for so saith *M. Morton* in this his booke: *The second obiection* (saith he) *is popular supposing Equiuocation to be a lye thus: There are three kind of lies &c.* Pag. 94. Doe yow see what manner of dealing heere is? We hold that no kind of lye is lawfull at all, nor that euer for any cause, vtility, or necessity it may be made lawfull,as after abundantly shall be declared. And againe we hold that some kind of Equiuocation,in some cases, may be lawfull; and how then doe we grant *that Equiuocation is a lye?* and how doth *M. Morton* suppose the same? and vpon that supposition doth found his argument to his popular Reader? Is not this cogging? Is not this cosenage? deceiptful dealing.

7. But yet further doe yow note another no lesse fraudulent then this. Catholike doctrine doth allow Equiuocation,but in certaine particuler cases, either for defence of obliged secret, or of innocency, iustice, and the like, which cases afterward shall be explained: It addeth also certaine prescript circumstances, as that it be not in matters of faith, nor in buying, selling, or common humane traffique to the hurte or preiudice of any man, and especially that the speach be not false in it selfe in the meaning of the speaker: and yet this Minister, as though we did put none of these conditions at all, but simply giue leaue to equiuocate in all thinges,doth exclaime against vs,

and runne vpon vs euen in those thinges that we doe expresly except, alleaging out of our owne Catholike Authors (for of his owne he hath none) that Equiuocation is not lawfull in matters of faith, nor to the hurte of any man in common conuersation, nor when there is falshood, or vntruth in it, and the like. And of this sorte of demeanour consisteth the substance of his whole Treatise, which he calleth *A Confutation of Equiuocation*; but euery man seeth what manner of confutation this is, to wit, plaine cauillation, & not vnlike to that of the foresaid Manichean Heretickes, who slaundered the Catholikes, that they allowed incontinency in general, for that in some persons they allowed the holy state of marriage; and like vnto the Protestantes of our dayes, who in the other extreame doe slaunder Catholickes to condemne marriage, as the *Manichies* did, for that in some they preferre chastity, and doe bind them vnto it, when they haue made vow therof. The *Pelagians* also deceaued the world by saying, that the Catholikes denied *Free-will*, with the *Manichies*, for that they condemned their presumptuous impiety of doing well without grace, and the Protestantes accuse vs at this day of *Pelagianisme*, for that wee hold, that mans will with grace may doe somewhat: and thus Heresy runneth alwayes to extremes, and will not vnderstand the true state of the question, nor suffer the Reader to doe it. And this being spoken by way of preface or preuention in this first Consideration, I now will passe ouer to other pointes in those that doe ensue.

The cauilling humour of Hereticks in mistaking the true state of the question.

The

The second Consideration. §. 2.

8. NOw then next to this is to be remembred by the iudicious Reader, that this point of doctrine of *Amphibology*, or doubtfull speach in some cases to be admitted, & heere obiected vnto vs by this Minister, vnder the odious titles *of heathenish and hellish Equiuocation, licence of lying and periury, blacke art*, and the like, is no new doctrine inuented of late against Protestāts by Catholickes, and much lesse by Iesuites, and least of all against the faith and surety of all common traffique, conuersation, publique and priuate dealing, as for some dozen of these later yeares, (to wit since the arraignement of *M. Robert Southwell*, when first they fell vpon it) they haue most odiously both in bookes, writinges, and sermons; yea Statutes also & lawes, iudgments, and arraignments iniuriously cried out against vs: This I say is manifestly conuinced to be false, for that this Minister himselfe doth in effect cõfesse heere in this fond Treatise of his, intituled by him *A Confutation of the wicked doctrine of Equiuocation*, that for the space of these last 400. yeares it hath byn receaued for true, and lawfull doctrine in our schooles, and consequently practised also throughout Christendome, when iust occasion was offered, without breach, or discredit of publique faith, or Christian fidelity in dealing one with another, which now is obiected, that it cannot stand, or consist, if this doctrine be permitted; wheras notwithstanding we learne, and see by experience, that in these foresaid foure hundred yeares past, when all Christendome was of our Religion, (if we belieue Histories & relation of our fore-Fathers) men liued as sincerly, and were of as good con-

2. The receaued vse of Equiuocation for 400. yeares.

Reply. Pag. 54.

conſcience, as they are now, if not better, and as little fraud, deceipt, and coſenage was vſed then, as now, if not farre leſſe. Yea and that at this day where this doctrine runneth as currant in all countries that are Catholicke, I doubt not but matters of conſcience, & conſcionable dealing, truſt in bargaining, ſincerity in ſpeach, and oathes, performance of promiſſes, hatred of lying and periury, is as vſuall, and frequent, if not more as it is to be found among Proteſtantes.

9. And further if we looke into England it ſelf, and if the Profeſſors of the one and other Religion be compared togeather for actions of good life and conſcience, by ſuch as be their neighbours, I doubt not, but that I may find witneſſes inough there of ſuch as know them both, and haue obſerued both their liues, manners, and deeds, to ouer rule this caſe: ſo as this very conſideration of the vniuerſality, and antiquity of the thing, and the experience of the fruites and ſequele therof for ſo many yeares and ages among our anceſtors, ought to ſtay the iudgment of a diſcreete man from crediting the outragious barking of theſe calumniating Miniſters, if no proofe els did appeare, as after there will be many: for that it is like, that our pious & prudent fore-Fathers would neuer haue admitted, & retained ſo long in practice ſuch a doctrine, if it had byn ſo heatheniſh, and helliſh, and preiudiciall to common faith, & honeſty, as theſe men make it now to be.

Experiẽce of long time a great proofe.

10. Yow ſhall heare ſome of this Miniſters wordes, and therby iudge of his pride, folly and inſolency in this matter, as alſo take a ſcantling of his and his fellowes intemperate ſpirites in whatſoeuer fancy they take in hand. *I am now* (ſaith he) *to encounter this newbred* Hydra, *and vgly monſter, which lurked a while in the inuiſible practiſe of the Equiuocating ſect, but at length diſcouered, and drawne into publicke &c.* And then further:

Reply. Pag 48.

I ſhall

I shall proue this Equiuocation, and approbation therof to be plaine lying, and shall shew that not one Iota in all Scriptures, nor one example in all Catholicke antiquity, nor one shaddow of reason in all the wit of naturall man, can be brought for the iust proofe, or colour of this mistery of iniquity. And yet further: *Now we must come into the listes of this conflict and enter vpon our Equiuocatour to conuince him a grosse liar by manifest argumentes.* And yet further: *For your grosse mentall reseruation, shew vs but one Father, either Greeke or Latin, one Pope, either Catholicke or Antichristian, one Author, either learned or vnlearned, who did euer so fancy.* And doe yow heare his vauntes? Did euer *Thraso* vpon a stage, or *Goliath* in the *Philisthines campe*, or *Rabsaces* at the walles of *Hierusalem* bragge or threaten more terribly then he? wee shal see afterward what his forces be.

Conf. p. 71.

1. *Reg.* 17. 4. *Reg.* 18. *Isa.* 36.

11. He doth grant as yow haue heard that this our doctrine of Equiuocation hath byn currant in Popish schooles for these last three or foure hundred yeares, and when he nameth Popish schooles, he must needes meane, for the first three hundred of those fower all the scholes commonly of Christendome, for that there were no other knowne in those dayes. And for this last hundred yeares since *Luther*, *Caluin*, and their followers haue risen vp, he must of force vnderstand the Catholicke scholes and vniuersities of all such countries and Kingdomes, as professe that Religion.

12. Now then let vs consider how such a doctrine as this, so impious in respect of conscience, so vnlawfull in respect of reason, so pernicious and preiudiciall in respect of the common-wealth, and mutuall conuersation, as these men make it, so heathenish, so hellish, so abhominable, so vgly, and monstrous, and the very mistery of iniquity it selfe; how this absurd, and impious opinion I say (if such it be) could come to be receaued so generally, both in approbation and practice, doctrine & action throughout the Christian

All sortes of learned men haue approued Equiuocation in certaine cases.

world, that is to ſay, the doctrine in all Scholes, Pulpittes, Chaires, Vniuerſities, where teaching hath byn vſed; extant alſo in the bookes and workes of all learned men of what ſort ſoeuer before Ieſuites were borne, or heard of, who are now principally charged with that doctrine: but eſpecially thoſe haue moſt treated therof, who haue written moſt tenderly of matters belonging vnto conſcience, whome we call Caſuiſtes; Lawiers in like manner, both Canon and ciuill, Deuines both ſcholaſticall and poſitiue haue approued the ſame.

13. And as for practice, it hath in due caſes byn receaued in all Courtes, in all countries, in all tribunalles and ſeates of iudgment, both Eccleſiaſticall and temporall, and neuer refuſed, condemned, or controlled by any, ſo it were vſed with the iuſt circumſtances, conditions and limitations before ſignified, & after more largely to be explained; for that a iuſt and law-full iudge may exceede his commiſsion and demaund, or vrge ſome things vnlawfully, and therby giue lawfull occaſion to the Anſwerer or defendant to auoid his iniuſtice by ſome kinde of Equiuocation: This I ſay being ſo, it ſeemeth morally impoſsible, that it ſhould haue byn brought into ſo generall a receaued practice, if the doctrine were ſo abſurd, and impious, as our aduerſaries would now make it. For I would aske them firſt *cui bono?* what intereſt or vtility could any learned mā haue to deuiſe this doctrine, or others to admit the ſame, when he had deuiſed it? was there no man to ſtand for truth and reaſon in any countrey, in any prouince, or ſtate? In any place, or time, within the compaſſe of theſe foure hundred yeares, to contradict ſo great an abſurdity, and ſo intolerable an iniquity? Would no Prince complaine, no Iudge, no Fiſcall, no Attorney pretēd that it did preiudice publique iuſtice, hinder the force of law-full examinations,

Diuers important demaundes to the aduerſary.

euacuate

euacuate the induſtry of Iudges, and other Magiſtrats, licence men to lye, weaken the ſinowes of all truth & fidelity,& rent & teare in ſunder all bands of common conuerſation amongſt men? Was there no man (I ſay) would obiect this then? No States-man, no Religious man, no man of ſcience or conſcience, aſwell then as now in England?

14. But heere perhaps ſome man will anſwere, that he findeth not ſuch generall vnion and conformity in this doctrine, among all Authors, but that ſome in ſome caſes haue reclaimed, denying ſome Equiuocations, which other doe allow. Wherto I anſwere, that this is but in particuler caſes, in regard of ſome particuler circumſtances, conditions, or limitations, wherby ſome kind of Equiuocation, or doubtfull Anſweres giuen in iudgment, or els where, may ſeeme to one man dangerous, or vnlawfull, which by another is iudged ſecure, and allowable: And in ſome ſuch particuler caſes, ſome learned writers may ſhew themſelnes more ſtrict, and ſcrupulous then others, as commonly *Sotus*, *Couarruuius*, *Azor*, and ſome others of theſe times doe in ſome ſpeciall points, wherin they doe diſſent from *Nauarre*, *Paludanus*, *Caëtan*, *Ioannes Maior*, *Fumus*, *Silueſter*, and other writers, about the ſaid particuler caſes, and manner of anſwering to be vſed, either in iudgment, or out of iudgment. And commonly the Ieſuites who aboue all others are accuſed and ſlaundered at this day in England for defence of this doctrine, are thoſe, that in their bookes doe ſhew themſelues moſt ſtrict and ſcrupulous, and doe put moſt reſtraints in particuler caſes, as by the very citations alleadged out of them by this Miniſter doth manifeſtly appeare: though yet in the ſumme and ſubſtance of the whole doctrine they all agree, that in ſundry important caſes, which afterwardes ſhall be touched, Equiuocation may law-fully be practiſed;

An obiection anſwered.

yea muſt alſo ſome time, when no other euaſion can be found for defence of innocency, iuſtice, ſecreſy, and other like vrgent occaſions.

15. Well then to conclude this ſecond conſideration, if this doctrine hath byn admitted for ſo long time in Chriſtendome as our aduerſaries doe confeſſe (though we ſhall proue afterward for much longer) and that it hath byn receaued for this time by them graunted, ſo vniuerſally & generally both by Prelats, Princes, and people, and if it haue byn ſo publickly taught by all learned men, and contradicted by none; it ought to be a great argument to moderate and diſcreete men, that it hath ſome ground of truth, and probability in it, and that the bragge of this Miniſter *Morton* before related that he will ſhew, *That not one Iota in all Scriptures, nor one example in all antiquity, nor one ſhaddow of reaſon in all the wit of naturall man can be brought for it*, is a very bragge indeed, worthy a man of his coat and calling, yea of his wit, and learning alſo. For either we muſt thinke him ſo naturall a man as he lacketh the reaſon of a naturall wit, or els he cannot thinke that ſo many hundreds, yea thouſandes of learned, and wiſe men, liuing within the compaſſe of theſe foure hundred yeares by him graunted, would allow of a doctrine *that had in it no one ſhaddow of reaſon in all the wit of naturall man.* And wheras he demaundeth, *but one Father, one Pope, one Author learned or vnlearned for proofe of this doctrine* he is like to haue ſo many alledged him afterward as he will find himſelf in brakes to anſwere any one of them.

A recapitulation of this conſideration.

The

The third Consideration. §. 3.

16. NExt after this commeth into consideration, not only the number and multitude of learned men that within the compasse of the foresaid foure hundred yeares haue approued this doctrine (for of former times we shall speak afterward) but their quality also, for opinion of eminent vertue, and holines of life, wherin truth and sincerity of speech, next after internall vertues, hath the highest place, and consequently it may be presumed, that they would neuer haue approued or vsed Equiuocation, if they had perswaded themselues that it had byn sinne, or offensiue to God in a far lesse degree then our Minister putteth it heere *for hellish and heathenish*. As for example *S. Thomas* of *Aquine*, *S. Bonauenture*, *S. Antoninus* Archbishop of *Florence*, *S. Francis* derided heere by T. M. for vsing Equiuocatiõ, as he saith, in sauing a poore man pursued by the officers of common iustice.

3. The quality and holines of the men that admitted Equiuocation.

17. .These men (I say) and their like, being holy & scrupulous of conscience, obseruant of their speech, & most vigilant to auoid, not only grosse and heynous sinnes of lying, and periury, but euen the least of ydle wordes; is it probable that they would haue admitted, taught, or vsed Equiuocation, if they had held it for lying, periury, or any way offensiue to almighty God? Or is it credible that our Ministers of England doe either see more, or are of more tender conscience then these men were? Or will any discreet man rest rather vpon the credit of these then of the other? And to come to some examples, when would *S. Thomas of Aquine* or *S. Francis* haue byn taken in halfe so many lies, throughout the whole course of their liues as

The comparison betweene the auouchers of Equiuocation and T.M.

T. *Morton* hath byn in this former Chapter only? No doubt but firſt they would haue loſt their tongues, then wittingly haue made any one of them; & yet ſhal we belieue him before them, or thinke them vnholy and him a Saint? them (I ſay) that had more learning in their little fingar, then he in all his body, more care of their tongues, then he of his ſoule, more feare to vtter an idle word, then he to auouch moſt manifeſt and groſſe lies? who will be ſo wilfull?

18. But to leaue theſe men that were ſo notorious Sainctes, and to looke vpon ſome other of our age, ſucceſſours and imitatours of them, both in learning and piety, as *Nauarrus*, *Scotus*, *Franciſcus de Victoria*, *Canus*, *Lopez*, *Bannes* & other famous men of diuers religious orders; as alſo all thoſe, which *Thomas Morton* after a new faſhiõ doth cite in all his Margents, by the name of Ieſuites, as *Cardinall Tolet*, *Cardinal Bellarmine*, *Alfonſus Salmeron*, *Emanuel de Sà*, *Gabriel Vaſquez*, *Franciſcus Suarez*, *Gregorius de Valentia*, *Maldonatus*, *Azorius* & others, wherby he ſeemeth to honour that order much, in granting to them the greateſt part of learned Catholicke writers now in Chriſtendome: theſe men (I ſay) what ſhall we thinke of them? Had they not learning ſufficient to ſee and diſcerne whether Equiuocation be a lye or no? Or had they not ſo much conſcience with their learning, to perceaue whether it be ſo pernicious, helliſh and heatheniſh as *Tho. Morton* affirmeth? Had they no ſcruple, no remorſe, no feare of God? What intereſt can they haue to hold that in ſome caſe the doctrine of Equiuocation is lawfull? Of Engliſh Ieſuites ſome may perhaps obiect, that they may be intereſſed vpon hope to eſcape ſometimes, or deliuer their friendes from the handes of their perſecutours, by vſing ſome Equiuocation, which yet is but a poore hope, and ſilly armour againſt ſo ſtrong an aſſault, as is raiſed vpon them. And if they had no other com-

Approuers of Equiuocation vvith due circũſtances.

fort,

fort, but that hope, their case were pittiful, that would aduenture into England, and put themselues vnder the danger of so sharpe lawes there, vpon that hope only.

19. But against their Brethren, Fathers, & fellowes in other countreyes no such interest can be pretended; for that neither doe they liue in danger of the temporall Magistrate, nor was this doctrine begun since the affaires of England were in this case, as now they are: so as no respect vnto England can be imagined to haue byn any cause or motiue to their generall consent herin, and consequently to see so many great learned men, as haue freely abandoned the world, and all prefermentes therof, only to serue God and saue their soules, to be of one opinion in this affaire, and to hold that in diuers cases, which afterward shall be specified, we may vse Equiuocation or amphibology of words, to conceale somewhat that may not be vttered, it ought to preuaile more with an indifferent discreet man in force of reason, then the vaine out-cries of this Minister, who yet as yow haue seene in the precedent Chapters is commonly taken tripping at euery turne, either with cunning Equiuocatiō or flat lying, which yet shall more be demonstrated herafter. And this shall suffice for this third consideration.

No respect of England or interest can be a motiue to externe Iesuites.

The fourth Consideration. §. 4.

20. AND now, as we haue seene both the generall admittance of this doctrine, and the practice therof throughout Christendome for so many ages, and the quality of the men that haue approued the same; all which may checke the insolent and ignorant

About the necessity of Equiuocation in some cases.

rant raging of this Miniſter againſt our doctrine therof: ſo if we ſhould draw neere vnto him, & preſſe him with the neceſsity therof in certaine caſes & occaſions which often occurre, and no way can be auoided, he would finde himſelf (no doubt) in great ſtraites to anſwere. As for example, if I ſhould propoſe that very demaund, which *M. Southwell* of bleſſed memory (againſt whome this calumniation was firſt vrged) propoſed in his arraignment at the barre, vnto his Accuſers, which was this: That if their Princeſſe then liuing Queene *Elizabeth* vpon a ſuddaine aſſault or inſurrection againſt her, ſhould be vniuſtly purſued by enemies (as many great Princes haue byn) with intention to depriue her, both of Crowne and life, and that only *Thomas Morton* knowing where ſhe were, ſhould be demaunded therof, and this with ſuch impetuoſity and eagerneſſe, as if he anſwered not directly to their demaund, her life and ſtate were vtterly loſt, what would he doe, or what might he doe in this caſe of his Princeſſe extreame diſtreſſe? For to diſcouer her were againſt iuſtice, and duty, in that ſhe is his leige, & innocently purſued; to deny that he knoweth where ſhe is, muſt be either a lye (which we all hold to be vnlawfull to be made, no not for the ſauing the temporall life of any, as in the next conſideration more largely ſhallbe declared) or by ſome Equiuocation or doubtfull ſpeech (but yet ſuch as is no lye) ſhe muſt be couered, and the perſecutours deluded, which our Miniſter thinketh not lawfull, but holdeth it for impious, yea helliſh, heatheniſh, and ſacrilegious alſo, if it be with an oath.

A caſe propoſed to T. M.

21. Well then what will he doe in this caſe? Will he diſcouer and deliuer vnto traitors his innocent Princeſſe? That were more impious and helliſh, as before hath byn declared. What will he doe I ſay? What will he determine? Perhaps he will fly to that example of

ple of Biſhop *Firmus* commended by *S. Auguſtine*, for that hauing hidden a man from the perſecutors, anſwered the ſeruantes and officers of the Emperours, that he would neither lye, nor diſcouer the man, but in this our caſe that anſwere would not ſerue, for ſuppoſe that *Thomas Morton* were taken and asked euen at the very dore of the houſe, where he had hidden his Queene, and that if he held his peace, or denied to anſwere, he ſhould therby diſcouer her to be there, and conſequently betray her, what could he doe, or rather what might he doe? Or what ought he to doe in ſo great a neceſsity? For what he would doe, I nothing doubt, to wit, that he either would betray her, or defend her with ſome notable lye, for ſo much as vpon ſo ſmall occaſions he lieth in this his booke ſo lowdly, and with ſo great facility, as yow haue now heard him

Aug. lib. contr mẽs dacium cap.13.

Conf.p.63

22. Diuers other ſuch caſes may fall out, as if in the ſacking of a Citty, a man ſhould ſee a virgin ſought for by furious and libidinous ſouldiars to be rauiſhed, and that I being demaunded where ſhe is, if I hold my peace or deny to anſwere, ſhe is therby diſcouered. And the like if I meeting theeues purſuing an honeſt man on the high way and demaunding me whether I ſaw him or no, if I make a lye, I offend God, if I confeſſe, I am cauſe of his deſtructiõ, if I deny to anſwere or doe hold my peace, it will be taken as a confeſsion: What were heere to be done? Hath God and nature, & law of iuſtice left no law-full euaſion in ſuch caſes? for ſtill we ſtand vpon our firſt principle, which in the next Conſideration more largely ſhall be confirmed, *that for the ſauing of any mans temporall life, we may not make any lye whatſoeuer*: What then were heere to be done? what to be ſaid? what way to be taken?

Other demaundes for T M. to diſſolue

23. The ſame demaundes may be made in matters of ſecrecy, either naturall or otherwiſe obliged by

oath, promiſe, or other band of conſcience. As if an vniuſt Iudge or Magiſtrate ſhould aske vs things that are without his iuriſdiction, to the preiudice of our ſelues, or of others, as by enquiring after ſecretes that doe not appertaine to him: Or if a iealous husband ſhould aske his wife whether ſhe had euer comitted falſhood againſt him, propoſing the preſent paine of death, except ſhe anſwered directly therunto, and many other ſuch like caſes, which I purpoſely pretermit. And it ſeemeth that *Thomas Morton* hath not ſtudied them, but Catholicke writers, both Deuines, Scholaſticall and Poſitiue, as alſo Lawyers both Canon and ciuill among vs doe diſcuſſe how men may beare themſelues therin, without ſin or offence to God, when they fall out, and this with more ſeuerity againſt lying, then any Proteſtant Author is ſeene to doe, as in the ſequent Conſideration will appeare.

Caſes concerning ſecrecy.

24. And heere I aske *Thomas Morton* further what he will ſay to all the ſtratagems in warre, for ſo much as there may be aſwell lying in factes, as in wordes, according as our *S. Thomas* and other Deuines doe hold; how will T. M. excuſe theſe ſtratagems, that is to ſay pollicies, deceiptes, and diſsimulations of enemies in warres, from lies? Will he condemne all ſuch ſtratagems as ſinfull, as heatheniſh, as helliſh, as impious? Why then doe his Proteſtãt Captaines & Leaders vſe them? why doe his Proteſtãt Miniſters that liue with them allow therof? Nay that which is much more, why doth *S. Auguſtine* approue the ſame, whoſe ſentẽce is: *Cùm iuſtum bellum quis ſuſceperit, vtrum aperta pugna vel inſidiis vincat nihil ad iuſtitiam intereſt:* When a man taketh vpon him a iuſt war, it importeth nothing to the iuſtice of the cauſe, whether he ouercome by open war or ſleights: which ſentence is ſo well liked by our Popes, lawyers and Deuines, as it is put into the corps of the Canon law. And what will T. M. then ſay to all this,

Aug. l. qu. 6. qu. 10.

Gratian. in cauſa 23. q. 2. §. Dominus.

all this, yea to many expreſſe examples in Scripture it ſelf?

25. And namely what will he ſay to the fact of *Ioſue* that going about to take the Citty of *Hai*, gaue order to his Captaines: *Ponite inſidias poſt Ciuitatem, nos terga vertemus &c.* Lay an ambuſh behinde the Citty by night, and we ſhall follow with an army in the morning, and when thoſe of *Hai* ſhal come forth to aſſaile vs, we will ſeeme to flee, *ſimulantes metum*, feigning to be afraid: What will he ſay to this ſtratageme? will he deny it to be a diſsimulation, and conſequently alſo an Equiuocation in fact? The matter is euident to the contrary by the text it ſelf: will he call it *a ſcarre of infirmity of the old Teſtament* (to vſe his owne Miniſteriall or rather *Manichean* phraſe) and thinke to eſcape therby? But againſt this is the expreſſe order, and commandment of God himſelf: *Pone inſidias vrbi poſt eam*, lay an ambuſh behinde the Citty, *ergo* ſtratagems in warre though they conteine deceiptes, diſsimulations, and Equiuocations, may be vſed in ſome caſes, and that lawfully without the ſinne of lying.

Ioſ.8.

The ſtratageme of Ioſue.

26. Another example moſt manifeſt is in the fourth booke of the Kinges, where the King of *Syria* ſending certaine Captaines with forces to apprehend the Prophet *Elizeus* in the Citty of *Dothaim*, he going forth of the Citty, and meeting with the ſaid Captaines, they not knowing him, ſaid vnto them: *Non eſt hæc via, neque iſta eſt Ciuitas; ſequimini me, & oſtendam virum quem quæritis*: This is not the way (to *Dothaim*) nor is this that Citty, but doe yow follow me, and I will ſhew vnto yow the man whome yow ſeeke for, and ſo they did, and he lead them into the middeſt of *Samaria* where the King of *Iſrael* his army might and would haue deſtroyed them, if the ſaid Prophet had permitted: So as this ſtratageme alſo, conteyning the exteriour ſhew: of a great vntruth, and falſhood, cannot be deined to

4.Reg.6.

The ſtratageme of Elizeus.

haue byn lawfull in this Prophet, as appeareth by the concurrence of God with diuers miracles in the ſame.

Iudith 11. 27. The like may be ſhewed out of the example of *Iudith*, who by the inſtinct of Almighty God, and his plaine ordinance, as the Scripture ſaith, was ſent to *Holofernes*, who told him a long narration of many thinges that in euent and outward ſhew were not true, as that he ſhould get not only *Betulia*, but *Hieruſalem* alſo, and conquer the whole nation of the Iewes, adding therunto this aſſeueration, *Et miſit me Dominus hæc nunciare tibi*, and our Lord hath ſent me to tell yow theſe thinges, by which ſtratageme (as yow know) ſhe deliuered her whole countrey from the forces of the ſaid *Holofernes*, which otherwiſe had byn like to haue deſtroyed them

The ſtratageme of Iudith.

28. And thus much in this place for ſtratagemes in warre: but for other examples great numbers might be alledged, wherin ſome Equiuocations muſt needes be admitted, though no ly; as that of the Angell appearing to *Toby* the elder, who being taken by him to be a man, and demaunded of what family or tribe he was, he ſaid, *ego ſum Azarias Ananiæ Magni filius*, I am *Azarias* the Sonne of the Great *Ananias*, wherunto *Toby* anſwered, *Ex magno genere tu es*, yow are of a great ſtocke indeed; which yet was not ſo in the vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker, and conſequently heere muſt be confeſſed an euident Equiuocation, or amphibology of ſpeach, wherby the hearer was deceaued. And not vnlike to this is that ſpeech of our Sauiour, when ſtanding in the temple, he vſed to the Iewes demanding a miracle: *Doe yow diſſolue this Temple, and I will build it vp againe in three dayes*, meaning the Temple of his body, but his hearers vnderſtood him of the materiall Temple of *Hieruſalem*, and ſo to their ſenſe it ſeemed that he ſpeake, for which cauſe they accuſed him afterward very ſolemnly therof at this paſsion, and inſulted

Tob. 5.

Other examples of Scriptures concerning Equiuocations.

Ioan. 2.

Math. 27.

ſulted againſt him for the ſame vpon the croſſe, *ergo* Equiuocation may not alwayes be condemned for lying, as our Miniſter auoucheth.

29. I pretermit diuers other ſpeeches of our Sauiour of like quality, as that when he ſaid to his brethren: *Ego non aſcendam ad diem feſtum iſtum*. I will not goe vp to *Hieruſalem* to this feaſt, and yet he meant to goe vp, and ſo went, but not in publicke, and therin ſtood the Equiuocation of his ſpeach; but his brethren vnderſtood not his meaning, for if they had, no doubt they would not haue gone vp without him, *ergo* one ſenſe was vnderſtood by the ſpeaker, and another by the hearer, which wee ſhall afterward ſhew to be properly Equiuocation, and yet no ly can be inforced theron, but with ſinguler impiety. Ioan. 7.

30. Theſe wordes alſo of *S. Paul* to the *Hebrewes: Melchiſedech King of Salem &c. which was without Father, without Mother, without genealogy, neither hauing beginning of his dayes, nor end of his life*, muſt needs be confeſſed to haue an Equiuocation or amphibology in them, and ſomewhat to be reſerued by the ſpeaker for their vnderſtanding: for as they lye, they ſeeme impoſsible to be true, that a man could be without Father, Mother, genealogy, beginning or ending, & yet is there no more expreſſed by the Apoſtle, but his meaning was that nothing is ſet downe in Scripture of thoſe particularities. Hebr. 7.

31. And finally the ſame Apoſtle *S. Paul*, ſeing himſelf preſſed at a certaine time in iudgment by his enemies, and conſidering that they were of two factions, *Phariſies* and *Saduces*, wherof the one ſort confeſſeth reſurrection of the dead, and the other not, he proteſted openly that the cauſe wherof he was accuſed, was about the ſaid reſurrection of the dead, which though in his ſenſe was true, for that his chiefe trouble was for defending the reſurrection of Chriſt, and

Some Equinocations vſed by S. Paul in his anſvvere to the vniuſt Ievves. Act. 23.

our hope of reſurrection by him: yet was it not ſo then in the vnderſtanding of the hearers, who vpon this, deviding themſelues, let him goe, yea the *Phariſies* began to excuſe & defend him in that Councell, who otherwiſe were the greateſt enemies of his Religion and profeſsion. By all which is ſeene that ſometimes of neceſsity wee muſt admit ſome vſe of Equiuocation without lying, for otherwiſe many places of the Scriptures themſelues and of other holy mens writings & doings cannot be well vnderſtood, or defended, as afterwardes more at large ſhall be ſhewed.

32. But now to paſſe no further in the recitall of more argumentes to this purpoſe, we may conclude with that common doctrine of Schole-men taken out of *S. Auguſtine* and other Fathers, that albeit a ly is lawfull in no caſe; yet often may it be lawfull to conceale a truth, for that he handling thoſe wordes of the Pſalme, *Thou ſhalt deſtroy all thoſe which ſpeake lyes.* he ſaith: *Aliud eſt mentiri, aliud verum occultare; aliud eſt falſum dicere, aliud verum tacere.* It is a different thing to ly & to conceale a truth; one thing to ſpeake that which is falſe, another thing to hold our peace in that which is true. And then concludeth: *Non eſt ergo culpandum aliquando verum tacere &c.* It is not therfore to be reprehended if a man ſometimes doe not vtter a truth; which hardly can be performed in ſundry caſes without ſome amphibology or Equiuocation of ſpeech, & conſequently that this may be without lying. And heerof one example may ſerue for all, taken out of *Hieremy* the Prophet, who hauing had a long conference in ſecret with *Sedechias* the King in *Hieruſalem*, & told him many thinges of the will of God about his voluntary yeelding to the *Chaldeans* and army of *Nabuchodonoſor*, King *Sedechias* in concluſion ſaid thus vnto him: *Nullus ſciat verba hæc &c.* Let no man know thoſe wordes that thou haſt ſpoken vnto me, and thou ſhalt not

Auguſt. in Pſal. 5, 22. quæſt. 2.

Pſal. 5.

Hier. 38.

not dye, & if the Princes or Noble-men of my King- „
dome ſhall heare that thou haſt ſpoken with me, and „
ſhall come vnto thee and ſay, tell vs what thou haſt „
talked with the King, and the King with thee, and „
ſee thou hide nothing from vs, thou ſhalt ſay vnto „
them &c. And the ſaid Princes came to *Hieremy*, and „
examined him, and he ſpake vnto them according to „
all the wordes which the King had commanded him, „
and ſo they left him. „

33. Thus far the Scripture, and no man can probably imagine but that in this recapitulation made by *Hieremy* vnto the Princes, of ſo long a conference had with the King in ſecret, but that for couering of thoſe thinges which the King would not haue to be vttered, and the Noble men were greedy to know, in ſuch a dangerous and ſuſpicious time of ſeige as that was, *Hieremy* himſelf being held for more then half a traitour to his countrey, for that he perſwaded men to yeeld themſelues to the common enemy; no doubt (I ſay) but that in ſo ſtrait an examinatiõ as they would make about that matter, in whoſe power his life and death (as the Scripture ſignifieth) did ly, diuers Equiuocations of ſpeeches muſt neceſſaryly be vſed by him, though alwaies with a true ſenſe in his meaning, which is the difference betweene Equiuocation and lying, as after more particulerly ſhall be ſhewed, if firſt we ſet downe one other conſideration for better declaring the difference in theſe two thinges, and how farre thoſe are from approbation of lying who in ſome caſes doe admit Equiuocation in our doctrine.

The

The fifth Consideration. §. 5.

5. How farre the allowers of Equiuocation are from approuing of lies.

34. IN the fifth place it may be considered about this matter, how farre the teachers or allowers of Equiuocation are from teaching or allowing of lies, which is the ordinary calumniation of this malicious Minister throughout his whole seditious booke; which if it be proued to be a false charge, then falleth all his accusation to the ground, or rather vpon his owne head. Wherfore we must stād somewhat more long vpon this point, then vpon the former, to the end it may appeare how fit a Minister of Sathan this is, whose principall exercise hath euer byn to calumniate from the beginning: and we shall talke especially of the Catholicke writers of these last foure hundred years by him mentioned, and of the Popes of the same time, that haue approued the same doctrine; for that of this principall accusation, that they made no difference betweene lying and Equiuocating, but expresly rather patronized the one as much as the other.

35. First then for battery of this wicked slaunder, we will beginne our confutation from the receaued authority of the famous learned doctor *S. Thomas* of *Aquin*, that liued and died aboue three hundred yeares gone. He proposeth this question in his most excellent Summe of Deuinity, *VVhether all kind of lying be alwayes a sinne*, and consequently vnlawfull for any cause? And he holdeth affirmatiuely, that it is so, alleadging many proofes and reasons for the same. And the very same seuerity of doctrine in that point doe hold all other Schoolemen, aswell after him, as before him, and our Minister himselfe citeth *Vasquez* the Iesuite late Reader of Deuinity in *Spaine*, in certaine disputations of his

D. Tho. 2. 2 quæst. 110 art. 1. 3. 4.

Reply par. 3. Pag. 62. *Vasq. disp. 53. nu. 22.*

his vpon *S. Thomas*, affirming: *Mendacium esse malum tam intrinsecè, vt bonum reddi nulla ratione possit.* That a lye is so intrinsecally euill of his owne nature, as that by no meanes it may be made good or lawfull. And the like rigour of doctrine teacheth the said *S. Thomas* in the next question after, against dissimulation and Hypocrisy, which he saith to be a kind of lye in fact, deceauing a man by exteriour signes or actes, as the other sort of lies doth by wordes: against both which kindes or sortes of lies or vntruthes he holdeth this conclusion, *That neither of them in any case is dispensable from sinne*, though in some cases one may be a lesse sinne then another; and if this be so, how then can *Equiuocation* be permitted by him, if he held it to be a lye, as our Minister would haue it. For if, as *Vasquez* said, no sort of ly can be made lawfull by any circumstãce; then must *M. Morton* grant, that it followeth by the same reason, that either *Equiuocation* is no ly, or els that *Vasquez* the Iesuite, and his fellowes doe not allow Equiuocation in any case whatsoeuer, & consequently that Iesuites are falsely accused by this fellow for admitting Equiuocation. But let vs goe forward, and shew his folly out of other Authors of no lesse antiquity.

D. Tho. 2. 2 quæst. 111. art. 1. & 4.

The seuerity of S. Thomas against lying and dissimulation.

36. Before *S. Thomas*, the Maister of the *Sentences Peter Lombard*, in his third booke, and 38. and 39. distinctiõ, holdeth the same seuerity against all sorts of lies, and falsities, deuiding them into three sortes, to wit, *pernicioſum, officioſum, & iocoſum*, the first pernicious, or malicious that intendeth hurt without good, the second that intendeth the good of some without hurte to any, the third in iest; all which notwithstanding are condemned for sinfull, and no wayes to be practised or tolerated for any cause whatsoeuer, though the secõd two sortes may be oftentimes veniall sinnes only; but yet of such nature, and so intrinsecally euill of themselues, as neither for sauing our owne liues, or the life

Mag. Sent. l. 3. dist. 38. & 39.

The Maister of the Sentences doctrine against lying.

of another man they ought wittingly to be committed, as out of *S. Augustine* also, by him and other Schoolemen alleadged is confirmed: yea they alleadge eight seuerall kinds, sortes, or degrees of lies out of the same *S. Augustine*, some farre lesse then others, but yet none allowable, and so they conclude with this sentence of the said Doctor: *Quisquis verò aliquod genus esse mendacij, quod peccatum non sit, putauerit, decipit seipsum turpiter, cùm honestum se deceptorem aliorum arbitretur.* Whosoeuer shall thinke that there is any kind of lye, which is not sinne, he fouly deceaueth himselfe by thinking that he may be an honest deceauer of other men.

Aug lib. de mend. ad cons. c. 14.

37. This is the doctrine of the *Maister of Sentences*, for foure hundred yeares past, and of other Schoole Doctors ensuing after him, vnto our time, wherin yow see how rigorous they are in condemning lying, wheron this Minister *Thomas Morton* either by chaũce, or his good happe stumbling, found store of matter to wrangle with vs in this controuersy, and to make a shew of some reading of different Authors, wherin otherwise he must haue byn very briefe and dry. For whatsoeuer he hath of ostentation in this behalfe against Equiuocation, is stolne ~~out~~ of the said *Maister of Sentences*, and Fathers by him alleadged, spoken, and meant by them against lying, and not Equiuocation. And is not this *a goodly manhood* trow yow? deserueth he not a laurell for this conqueste? Our Authors detest lying, and admit in some cases Equiuocation, he applieth their detestation to Equiuocation, or their admittance to lies, and saith, *that he deuideth our tongues, & turneth our owne Authors against vs:* what a ridiculous toy and foolery is this? But let vs see yet somewhat further.

Thomas Mortons toyes.

38. The same Schoole Doctors stay not heere, but doe passe on to many other particularities for shewing their detestation against the foresaid kind of lying, for

fauouring

fauouring wherof they are brought into queſtion by this Miniſter. As for example, wheras they write that *God is omnipotent*, and can doe all thinges, and vſe his creatures to what end and vſe it ſhall pleaſe him; yet cannot he neither by his ordinary, nor abſolute power, either by himſelfe, or by another concurre to the making of a lye fraudulently to deceaue the vnderſtāding of man or Angell, or induce another ſo to deceaue the ſame, with intention indeed of deceipt or fallacy. Of which point of doctrine the ſaid Schoole-Doctors and others after them doe diſpute largely vpon the third article of *S. Thomas* his ſecond Part, and firſt queſtion of his Summe of Deuinity, demaunding this doubt: *VVhether any kind of deceipt or falſity by any meanes, mediatly, or immediatly, may proceed from God*; which they hold negatiuely, that it is impoſsible, he being truth it ſelfe, and the fountaine of all truth and ſincerity in others. And albeit there be many and great arguments alleadged out of Scriptures, which in ſhew doe proue the contrary, to wit, that God not only can by his abſolute power, but hath alſo oftentimes in effect deceaued others, by meanes of wicked ſpirites, as *S. Auguſtine* alſo holdeth, and is euident by many places of Scripture, as 2. *Reg.* 22. where to deceaue *Achab*, it is ſaid: *Dedit Dominus ſpiritum mendacem in ore omnium Prophetarum.* God gaue a lying ſpirit in the mouth of all his falſe Prophettes. And *Eſay* 63. *Ezech.* 14. *Iob* 12. *Rom.* 1. it is ſaid expreſſely, that God deliuereth men into a reprobate ſenſe, which is the worſt ſort of deceauing a mās vnderſtāding that may be: yet to all this they anſwere out of the ancient Fathers, and Scripture it ſelfe, that God doth only permit men to be deceaued, and to beleiue vntruth, but doth not concurre actually or effectually to the ſame by any cooperation of his to any falſhood or vntruth whatſoeuer, nor can he doe it by any power of his, for that he ſhould impugne himſelfe

Read in 2. 2 quæſt. 1. art. 2. Gregor. de Valent. Duran. in 3. diſt. 24. quæſt. 2. Marſil. in 3. q. 14. Canus l. 2. de locis cap. 3. Greg. Arim. in 1. diſt. 42. q. 2. & alios.

Aug. l. 83. q. q. vltima.

God cannot deceaue or cooperate to an vntruth.

which is truth. And this is the greateſt and higheſt deteſtation of lying vſed by our Doctors that poſsibly can be imagined: and yet will the lying Miniſter ſay that they are *fautors*, *Fathers*, *and patrons of lying*. But let vs ſee more of our Schoole-Doctors in this behalfe.

39. Our learned countreyman alſo *Alexander of Hales*, liuing before *S. Thomas*, and as ſome ſay was his Maiſter, being held for one of the moſt learned of all Schoole-men that euer were before or after him, doth handle diuers queſtions very learnedly and piouſly about this point for deteſtatiõ of lying, as namely one, *VVhy theft and man-ſlaughter may be lawfully permitted in ſome caſes, and lying neuer*. Alſo how it cõmeth to paſſe, that the leaſt degree of lying that is, to wit *an officious, or ieſting ly*, which in ordinary imperfect men is only a venial ſinne, may come to be in men of perfection a mortall and damnable ſinne, concluding thus: *Quod ſicut de Adam dicitur, quòd ratione ſtatus ſui peccauit mortaliter, ita & iſte ratione ſtatus in hoc genere peccat mortaliter.* As it is ſaid of *Adam*, that by reaſon of his high ſtate of innocency he ſinned mortally (in eating an apple by diſobedience) ſo this man profeſsing perfection of life in a religious ſtate, by any ſort of voluntary lying, ſinneth mortally; for which he alleadgeth diuers authorities of *S. Auguſtine*, as namely this; *Sanctus vir &c.* A holy man that doth perfectly cleaue to God, which is truth it ſelfe, is forbidden either purpoſely, or raſhly to vtter vntruth, and for that the Scripture ſaith, *He that lieth killeth his owne ſoule*, and againe, *Thou ſhalt deſtroy all thoſe that ſpeake lies*, perfect men doe fly with all care theſe kindes alſo of leaſt lies in ſuch ſort, as no mans life may be defended therby, leaſt they hurt their owne ſoules, while they goe about to profit another mans fleſh.

Alex. Halens. 2. p. ſumme Theolog. q. 122.

Aug ſuper illud Exod. 1. Bene ergo fecit &c.

40. Againe the ſaid Father in another place: *Tam*

ſibi

sibi clausum deputat ad subueniendum hominem per mendacium, quàm si per stuprum transire cogatur. A good and perfect man doth thinke the way so shut vnto him from helping another man by any kinde of lye, (though neuer so officious) as if it were required at his hand to helpe him by cõmitting rape or inceſt: nay yet *Halensis* goeth further proposing this question; Whether if a man did certainly know, that by any least kinde of lying on his behalfe, he might conuert an Infidell to Christianity, and not otherwise, whether he might doe it, or no, and then concludeth that he may not in any case, alleadging this reason out of *S Augustine*, that as it is not lawfull for me to procure another mans chastity by my owne sinne of carnality; so much lesse is it lawfull to bring another man to the knowledge of truth, by my corrupting of truth. So this holy Religions Countreyman of ours, whose cõscience let the indifferent Reader compare with that of this irreligious Minister, who not only in iest, or officious lying to any mans good, either in body or soule, but in malicious lying, in preiudice of both, is euery where taken most manifestly, as before yow haue seene, and shall againe after vpon sundry occasions.

Aug. lib. contra mend. cap. 20.

The rigorous sentence of Halensis against lying.

41. Well then this seuerity of doctrine is taught by our Catholicke Deuines, against the sinne of simple lying. But if we talke of lying in an oath, which is periury, euery man may imagine how much more earnestly the same is detested by them, in so much as the famous Doctor *Nauarre* before mẽtioned, who is held to be one of the most liberall, and largest in admitting Equiuocations both in wordes and oathes, with the due circumstances, and hath written three whole Treatises about the same: yet is he so seuere and rigorous against lying and periury, as he teacheth, that it is a mortall and damnable sinne to sweare falsely, euen in iest. And others yet goe further, auouching that it

Nau. com. 2. in com. in cap. humanæ aut. res. 22. q. 5 p. 453.

Ludouic. Lopez. in Instructorio conſc. c.42. de iuramento: §. quanquam. Caetan. Comm. in 2.2.q.791. art.3.

is damnable to ſweare inconſiderately by euill cuſtome, yea ſometimes alſo though the thing in it ſelfe be true which he ſweareth: the reaſon wherof they alleadge to be this, for that the act of ſwearing being *actus latriæ*, as Deuines call it, that is to ſay, an act of higheſt honour to God, for that he is cited and alleadged in an oath, as an infallible witnes, the man that accuſtometh to ſweare raſhly putteth himſelfe in manifeſt danger to ſweare alſo falſely, & therby ſinneth mortally, albeit, for that time he ſweareth the thing that is true, but as eaſily would he haue done it, thogh it had byn falſe, in reſpect of his yll cuſtome of ſwearing raſhly, and conſequently, no leſſe diſhonour and contempt doth he vſe towardes the Maieſty of Almighty God therin, then if he had ſworne falſe, which is an important note for raſh ſwearers to conſider of and remember.

A man may ſinne mortally in ſweaſing truth.

42. Well now all this being ſo, will our Miniſter ſtill ſtand in his obſtinate calumniation, *that we are louers of lies, patrons of periury, defenders & allowers of falshood,* *Conf.p.48* *Doctors of deceauing*, and the like? will he ſtill defend, *that there is nothing but lying in Rome*? and *that the Sea Apoſtolike graunteth out full priuiledge of lying*, as before yow haue heard him auouch? how then if I ſhew that all this, and much more againſt lying which yow haue heard out of the Schoole-men, and ancient Fathers, is not only allowed & admitted by the *Sea* of *Rome*, but tranſlated alſo by the Popes therof into the corps of their Canon law, and ſo not only approued, but commended and commaunded alſo to be obſerued? Can any thing conuince more our Miniſters Calumniation then this? Let any man looke then vpon the ſecond Part of *Gratian* his *Decretals* throughout the two and twentith *Cauſe* for fiue whole queſtiõs togeather, there he ſhall find not only the ſubſtance of all this, that heere I haue ſaid, but much more cited out of all

All the former rigour againſt lying and periury approued by Popes.

the an-

the ancient Fathers, Popes, & Councels to this effect.

43. For there he ſhall find ſet downe out of *S. Auguſtine*, and Canonized, the foreſaid diſtinction of eight ſortes or degrees of lying, with a reprobation of them all, where hauing cited thoſe wordes of *S. Auguſtine*; *Non eſt igitur mentiendum in doctrina pietatis, quia magnum ſcelus eſt, & primum genus deteſtabilis mendacij*; we muſt not lye concerning doctrine of piety, or matters touching our faith, for that it is a heynous ſinne, and the firſt kind of deteſtable lying: he paſſeth downeward by all the reſt, excluding them one by one, and concluding: *Quòd neque pro cuiuſquam temporali commodo ac ſalute veritas corrumpenda eſt, neque ad ſempiternam ſalutem vllus ducendus eſt opitulante mendacio:* Neither is truth to be corrupted for any mans temporall commodity, nor is any man to be brought to eternall ſaluation by the helpe of a lye; So *S. Auguſtine:* And ſo *Gratian* that alleadgeth him aboue foure hundred yeares gone; and ſo all the Popes that haue Canonized this ſaying of his, & determined it for *Canonicall law* euer ſince to our dayes. And with what impudency then ſaith this Miniſter, *from whence ſhall a man except priuiledge of lying, then from that place, where (as your owne learned Bishop ſaith) there is nothing but lying*; which in deed is lying vpon lying, for that *Eſpencæus* whome he citeth in the margent ſaith not ſo, *there is nothing but lying*, as in another place ſhall be ſhewed; and if he did, yet the thing it ſelfe is euidently proued to be falſe by this, that we haue alleadged out of the Popes Canons, affirming all ſortes of lies whatſoeuer to be indiſpenſable. Let any man then belieue theſe fellowes that will be deceaued.

Cauſa 22. q 2. c. 8. §. Primum eſt.

Conf. p. 48

44. But the Popes Canons goe yet further, and doe decree, & determine out of the authority of the ſame Father *S. Auguſtine* and other Fathers, ſundry pointes of greater perfection againſt the ſinne of lying, as this for example: *Quod non licet alicui humilitatis cauſa mentiri:*

Cap 9. Ex Aug. de verbis Apoſtoli ſerm. 31.

It is

It is not lawfull for any man to lye out of humility, ſaying leſſe of a mans ſelfe then truth permitteth. And againe in another Canon: *Non licet mentiri, vt arrogantia vitetur*, it is not lawfull to lye, that arrogancy therby may be auoided.

Cap. 10. ex Aug. tract. in Ioa. 43.

45. And as for periury which is a lye cõfirmed with an oath, the ſaid Canons are ſo ſeuere, as they doe not only deteſt the ſame, both in him that forſweareth, & in him that induceth another therunto, but doe alſo appoint greiuous penitentiall puniſhmentes for the ſame. As for example: *Qui compulſus à Domino ſciens peierat* (ſaith one Canon) *vtrique ſunt periuri, & Dominus & miles: Dominus quia præcepit, miles quia plus Dominum, quàm animam dilexit: ſi liber eſt quadraginta dies in pane & aqua paniteat, & ſeptem ſequentes annos.* If any man compelled by his Lord, ſhall wittingly forſweare himſelfe, both of them are periured, as well the Lord as the ſeruant: the Lord for commanding, and the ſeruant, for that he hath loued his Lord more then his owne ſoule: let him doe pennance by faſting in bread and water fourty dayes, and ſeauen yeares afterward. *Et nunquam ſit ſine pœnitentia*, ſaith another Canon, let him neuer ceaſe to repent, and doe ſome penance for this greiuous ſinne, ſo long as he liueth. And heere is to be noted, that *S. Anſelme* doth cite this puniſhment out of the penitentiall decrees of our ancient *Theodorus* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, wherby it apperteineth the more to my Lord that now is of that Sea, to looke to this his Chaplaine, or miles *Morton*, and finding him guilty of lying againſt his owne often oathes and ſolemne proteſtations, as we haue diſcouered him in this our anſwere, to caſt ſome little aſperſion at leaſt of penitentiall ſatisfactions vpon him. And if forty dayes in bread & water may ſeeme to much, let him faſt ſome fower with contrition, and that perhaps may doe him more good then any bookes or writing againſt him.

Cauſ. 22. q. 5 cap. 1.

Ibid. c. 4.

But

But to retourne to *Gratian*. He reciteth diuers other Canons out of ſundry ancient Councels, Fathers, and Popes decrees, as out of *S. Auguſtine: Homicidam vincit, qui ſciens ad periurium hominem prouocat*, he paſſeth a murderer in wickednes, that wittingly doth prouoke another man to periury: and the reaſon heerof is added in the Canon; *for that a murderer killeth but the body, this the ſoule; nay two ſoules, both his that forſweareth, & his owne that prouoketh.* So that Canon; which me thinketh were ſeriouſly to be conſidered, by them that force others to ſweare againſt their conſciences, knowing or preſuming probably that the ſwearers conſciences are oppoſite to that which they are forced to ſweare: and conſequently, according to this rule of *S. Auguſtine* doe murther eternally both their owne ſoules, and thoſe of them that doe vrge them therunto. Neither ſhall it be needfull to adde any more in this place ſeing the ſaid Canons are extant to be read and ſeene by al, and allowed, authorized, and ſet forth for ſacred and authenticall by all Popes whatſoeuer.

Cauſa 22. q. 5. c. 5. Ex Aug. ſer. 11. de ſanctis.

46. My concluſion therfore vpon this fifth conſideration is, that for ſo much as Romiſh Catholicke doctrine doth teach and preſcribe all this rigour, and ſeuerity againſt lying and periury, which in Proteſtants bookes, touching caſes of conſcience, we haue not hitherto ſeene expreſſed; it may well be inferred, that if *Equiuocation* were held for lying; it would in no caſe be allowed by the ſame doctrine, as lying is not. And that if the Sea of Rome did giue out priuiledges for lying and periury ſhe would not authorize ſuch ſeuere penitentiall Canons againſt the ſame, and that if nothing but lying were there, as *Morton* ſaith there is not, then were this lying alſo that ſhe doth acknowledge theſe Canons, which yet is proued by the printed bookes that are extant therof: and to theſe inferences I doe not ſee what can be anſweared, or brought to

The Concluſion of this conſideration.

the contrary, except only our Minister would say, that all our Doctors are deceaued, in distinguishing betweene lying and Equiuocation; which if he say, he doth first quit vs from lying wittingly, & consequently from lying at all, for that according to *S. Augustine* & all other Doctors, he that lieth thinking that he doth not lye, lieth not at all, *quia non facit linguam ream, nisi mens rea*, nothing maketh the tongue guilty of lying, but a guilty mind, and consequently T. M. hauing accused vs so often and earnestly of wilfull lying, hath wilfully slaundered vs, and heere vnwittingly cleareth vs. And as for the second, whether our Doctors doe well and rightly distinguish betweene lying and Equiuocation, shall now presently be discussed in the sequent Chapters of this Treatise.

Aug. in Enchirid. cap. 18. & cont. mēd. cap. 5.

THE

THE SVBSTANCE OF THE CAVSE IS ENTERED INTO;

And it is discussed, *What Equiuocation, what truth, what falsity, and lying is:*

And some other points to this effect.

CHAP. VIII.

AND forasmuch as all the Considerations laid forth in the former Chapter, haue byn set downe only by way of preamble, for better vnderstanding the true state of the controuersy; it shall be now expedient, that we draw neere to the substance of the matter and yssue it self, especially being called therunto by the confident prouocation of our Aduersary, who hauing made that vainglorious entrance to his Treatise of confutation, which before we touched; to wit, *I am now to encounter this new-bred-hydra and vgly monster &c.* *And I shall proue this Equiuocation and ap-* *Conf. p. 47*

probation therof to be lying, and that no one Iota in all Scripture, no one example in all antiquity, no one shaddow of reaſon in the naturall wit of man, can be brought for any proofe or colour therof: After theſe bragges (I ſay) he paſſeth to another ſolemne vaunt ſaying: *Now muſt we come into the liſtes of this conflict, and enter vpon our Equiuocatour to conuince him a groſſe lier*, wherby yow ſee his great confidence in the cauſe, which I cannot aſcribe to any thing, more then to ignorance. For if he had vnderſtood well, or weighed the points before laid downe, or theſe other which preſently we are to adioine, I doe not ſee how he could haue ſpoken ſo confidently in ſo bad a cauſe.

Pag. 50.

2. For what? will he hold that all kind of Equiuocation is lying? If he doe, he forgetteth himſelf, for he granted in the very next precedent page, that one ſort of Equiuocation (which afterward we ſhall proue to be the only) is no ly. For that hauing ſet downe, as it were, for a principle or foundation of all his Treatiſe, what we doe hold in this behalf, he ſaith, that we doe teach a double Equiuocation, the one mentall when any thing is reſerued in mind, differing from that which outwardly is expreſſed, as when a Catholicke being demaunded, whether he haue any Prieſt in his houſe, may anſwere by Equiuocation that he hath none, reſeruing in his mind *that he hath none whome he is bound to vtter or diſcouer*: the other kind is verball, when one word (he ſhould haue ſaid alſo ſpeach) ſhall import two or more ſignifications, as if a man ſhould ſay *yow goe to faſt*, or *yow may not ly in my houſe*, the word *faſt*, may ſignify either faſting or haſty going, and *lying* may ſignify either remaining, or telling vntruth. And the like example may be taken out of *Ariſtotle* himſelf, of the word *Dogge*; as if one ſhould ſay, *I am afraid of a Dogge*, the ſpeach is doubtfull and equiuocall, for that the word *Dogge* hath a triple ſignification, to wit a domeſticall dogge, a dogge fiſh in the ſea, or a ſigne in the

Conf. f. 48

Two ſortes of Equiuocation.

Ariſt. 1. Elench. c. 3

the heauenly spheare, wherin when the sunne hath his course we call them dogge dayes, of which some man being afraid for his health, may say, *I feare the Dogge &c.*

3. Now then these two sortes of Equiuocations being set downe, T. M. is forced presently to grant, that the later sort, whether it be in word or speech, is no ly of it self; for who would say, that a man lyeth in vsing the different significations of any word or speach? Who will affirme that he saith an vntruth, if for example, he being of a hoate & sickly complexion, and fearing the Canicular-dayes, should say, *I feare the dogge*, meaning the dangerous influence of that celestiall signe, or of those Canicular-dayes: so as now by his owne confession, (for in effect he confesseth it in this place, and can doe no other) this second part or member of Equiuocation, is no ly; notwithstanding perhaps the hearer should be deceaued, & vnderstand the speaker to meane of a domesticall dogge, when he meaneth the celestiall. And of this more examples shalbe giuen afterwardes out of the Scripture it self.

Verball Equiuocatiō no ly.

4. But heere is to be noted that *Aristotle*, whome *M. Morton* stileth by the title of *Oracle of all Logitians*, setteh downe three sortes or degrees of Equiuocation: the first in word or speach, when it hath diuers significations: the second in custome of phrase: the third in composition of single partes togeather. Of the first he giueth the example before mentioned of a dogge, that hath different significations, of the secōd, though he name no example, yet this may be one, if I should say: I esteeme him a wise man that can hold his peace, it would be vnderstood in English for him that can gouerne his tongue, & this in respect of our English phrase or custome of speach, but in any other language it would rather be vnderstood for him that can liue in peace, or maintaine the peace he hath made

Three sortes of Equiuocation out of Aristotle.

with his Aduerſary; ſo as the Equiuocation or multiplicity of ſenſe, riſeth heere out of our Engliſh cuſtome of phraſe as yow ſee.

5. Of the third ſort he alleadgeth many examples, and among other this: *Poſſibile eſt ſedentem ambulare, & non ſcribentem ſcribere:* That one ſitting may walke, and one not writing may write, in which ſentences the wordes being taken ſeparatly and a part out of compoſition, they haue but ſimple and plaine ſignifications, but being compounded in this manner as they ly, haue manifeſt Equiuocation and amphibology in them, by reaſon of compoſition. For if wee vnderſtand that a man ſitting, while he ſitteth, can walke, or while he writeth not, can write, which is, as Logitians ſay, *in ſenſu compoſito*, it is not poſsible: but if we vnderſtand it *in ſenſu diuiſo*, that he that ſitteth now may walke afterward, or he that writeth not now, hath power to write afterward, no man will deny it; and yet are neither of thoſe thinges falſities or lies but only Equiuocall or amphibologicall propoſitions, that may be true in diuers ſenſes, and yet deceaue the Reader or hearer if he ſtand not attent.

6. But now whether T. M. will admit our former reſerued propoſition, *which is partly mentall and partly verball*, vnder any of theſe three ſortes of Logicall Equiuocations, I know not: but if he doe, then muſt he confeſſe the ſaid propoſition to be no lye, which is contrary to his aſſeueration in this place, ſaing *that euery ſuch Equiuocation is a groſſe lye:* and if he doe not, then muſt he acknowledge his Oracle of Logitians to haue erred groſſely in making an inſufficient diuiſion, which comprehendeth not all the partes of the thing deuided. For if the ſaid mixt propoſition be an Equiuocation, then muſt it haue place amongeſt ſome of theſe three kindes, or els the diuiſion ſhould be inſufficient: *Quia latius pateret diuiſum, quàm partes diuidentes.*

T.M. maketh his oracle to erre in Logicke.

7. But

7. But howsoeuer this be, yet *M. Morton* who euery where pretendeth great skill in Logicke, and therin also to be a cunning *Aristotelian*, calling the first (as yow haue heard) *the art of artes, and high tribunall of reason*, and the second *the Oracle*, shewing also some disdaine, when his Aduersary doth but so much as name Logicke in his behalf; this man (I say) committeth heere one of the most childish absurdities, against both *Aristotle* and Logicke, that commonly can be committed by one that knoweth the first principles therof: for he maketh *Aristotle* to define the whole by the definition of a part, as if one should define a man by the definition of the body, or the body by the definition of one legge, or the whole science of Phisicke, by the skill of the herbal, or of the pulse, or in-sight in waters, which are but seuerall partes of Phisicke: euen so doth *M. Morton*, taking-vpon him to set downe the definition of Equiuocatiõ, therby to impugne our foresaid mentall proposition, saith thus: *Equiuocation in word or speech (saith the Oracle of all Logitians) is whẽ one word, or one speach doth equally signify diuers thinges, as when one shall say, I am afraid of a dogge &c.* which how wisely he applieth to his purpose to ouerthrow our proposition therby, & to proue it no proposition at all, shall afterward appeare; now only is to be noted that these wordes are not the wordes of *Aristotle* in defining, but in deuiding Equiuocation, and the very first therof to wit, *Equiuocation is &c.* are fisted in by *Morton* himself, as also the Greek therof set downe by him for ostentations sake in his margent, for that Aristotle there making a diuision of three sortes of Equiuocation before mentioned, describeth only the first sort therof in these wordes: *There are three sortes or manners of speach according to Equiuocation, and amphibology, the one, when a speach or word doth principally signify many thinges, as an Eagle, or Dogge &c.* so as heere besides the sleight or falshood which is familiar

Pag. 53.

Conf. p. 54

Homonymía 'estìn &c.

Arist. l. 1. Elench. c. 3

'Eisì dè trêis trópoi tôn

parà tèn homonymían, kaì tèn amphibolian· hêis mèn &c.

miliar vnto our aduerſary, he is conuinced either to haue abuſed greatly his Oracle, in making him to erre groſſely in ſetting downe a diuiſion of three partes of Equiuocation, wheras there is but one, or in defining the whole by a part only, as before hath byn declared, wherof would follow that his definition *non conuertitur cum definito*, the greateſt abſurdity that in Logicke can be committed. Or laſtly (which I eaſieſt belieue) that he vnderſtood not Ariſtotle, though he would make a floriſh therof, & ſo following the bat in flying haſtily without light, hath broken his head on the walles before he was a ware.

8. But to returne to conſider ſomewhat further of the nature of Equiuocation, yow will aske me (perhaps) what is the proper definition of Equiuocation, and how is the former mixt propoſition partly mentall and partly verbal, truly called Equiuocal or Equiuocation, for ſo much as it ſeemeth by that which hitherto hath byn ſaid, that of the double kind ſet downe in the beginning, to wit mentall and verball, the ſecond only may properly be called Equiuocation, that is to ſay, when a ſpeach or word ſignifieth diuers thinges equally, which I grant alſo to be true, if wee conſider the proper nature of Equiuocation treated by *Ariſtotle*, and his particuler ends and reaſons which he had in treating therof, which endes by his Expoſitours are ſaid to be two.

9. The firſt as it ſerueth to diſcerne captious and ſophiſticall ſillogiſmes, from demonſtratiue and dialecticall; to which end he alledgeth ſix ſeuerall kindes of the ſaid captious ſpeeches in his firſt booke of Elenchs; and Equiuocation is the firſt, amphibology the ſecond: which Equiuocation is deuided (as yow haue heard,) into three degrees before ſpecified, to wit, into Equiuocation of ſpeach or wordes that haue diuers ſignifications; into Equiuocation by cuſtome

Ariſt. l. 1. Elench. c. 3

of

ction of the dead, wherof we ſhall haue better occaſion to ſet downe afterward many examples, which no wayes cā be auoided from vntruth, but only by ſome kind of mentall reſeruation in the ſpeaker; though *Thomæ Morton* ſtriue and ſtruggle neuer ſo much to fly the ſame: but the more he ſtruggleth, the more he intangleth himſelf like a fox in a net.

12. His ſecond concluſion alſo (for two only he maketh conteining the whole ſubiect of his Treatiſe) ſeemeth to me very fond, ſimple, and vntrue, where he ſaith: *Our ſecond concluſion is thus, that euery Equiuocation, whether it be mentall or verball, if it be vttered in an oath, though it be neuer ſo holy, yet is it an abhominable prophanation of that ſacred inſtitution of God*; and I would aske him why? for that whatſoeuer may be truly ſaid may be truly ſworne alſo, and without prophanation, ſo it be done with the due circumſtances of truth, iuſtice, and reuerence; an oath being nothing els, as Deuines doe define it, but the calling of God to witnes in any thing that is affirmed or denied. And as for mentall reſeruation, I would aske T. M. whether a man may not aſwell ſweare, as ſay the foreſaid ſentence of the Prophet, *wicked men ſhall not riſe in iudgment?* And for verball Equiuocation, I would demaund him, whether a man may not ſweare that which Chriſt our Sauiour ſaith and affirmeth to be true, as for example, *Elias iam venit*. *Elias* is come; and againe of *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, *Ipſe eſt Elias*, he is *Elias* himſelf, where the word *Elias* hath plaine Equiuocation in it, for that it ſignifieth both the perſon and ſpirit of *Elias*, and in *S. Iohn* was the one and not the other. And againe that ſaying of our Sauiour, *Diſſolue this Temple, and in three dayes I will raiſe it vp againe*, the word *Temple* hath an euident verball Equiuocation, for it ſignifieth both the materiall Temple, and Chriſtes body, and therby deceaued euen the wiſeſt hearers, who vnderſtanding the one ſenſe, which

T M his 2. concluſion.

Equiuocation both mentall & verball ſhewed out of Scripture.

Math. 17. Marc 11. Math. 11.

Ioan. 2.

Math. 26. Marc. 14.

was the more common, obiected the ſame to our Sauiour both in his iudgment, and vpon the Croſſe; and yet was there neither ly, falſhood, nor prophanation in this ſpeach, though Equiuocall; no if our Sauiour had ſworne it, for his word was of more truth and reuerent reſpect to God his Father, then our oath can be. And heerby may our Miniſter ſee his wit in ſetting downe ſo reſolute a concluſion.

13. But there be many more examples as euident as this, as, *Et ego ſi exaltatus fuero à terra omnia traham ad meipſum*; when I ſhall be exalted from the earth I will draw all thinges vnto my ſelf, where the word *Exaltation* may haue many ſenſes, as to be exalted to heauen, or to glory, which moſt men would vnderſtand, rather then an exaltation vpō a Croſſe, which Chriſt vnderſtood, and conſequently his ſpeech was mixt with amphibology and Equiuocation; as were alſo the wordes *omnia traham*, which may haue ſundry ſenſes, and ſome in apparence not true. And in like manner when he ſaid of *Lazarus* ſicknes, *Infirmitas hæc non eſt ad mortem*, this ſicknes it not to death; and yet he died, and conſequently there was a further ſenſe reſerued. And in the ſame place, *Lazarus amicus noſter dormit*, our friend *Lazarus* ſleepeth; the word *dormit* ſignifieth Equiuocally either to ſleep or be dead, Chriſt vnderſtood of the ſecond, his Diſciples of the firſt: & will yow ſay that he did abuſe or deceaue them, or vſe prophane ſpeach in this Equiuocation? And yet further the ſame Equiuocation our Sauiour vſeth in thoſe wordes, *Ignem veni mittere in terram, & quid volo, niſi ut ardeat*, I came to caſt fier into the earth, and what would I els, but that it burne? The word *fier* ſignifieth both naturall fier, and zeale or feruour of ſpirit, and *burning* hath the like ambiguity; and is this alſo prophanation, if it were to be ſworne, as Chriſt did ſpeake it?

Ioan. 12.

Ambiguous and Equiuocall ſpeaches of our Sauiour.

Ioan. 11.

Luc. 12.

14. In

of phraſe; and into Equiuocation by compoſition of ſingle, and ſimple partes togeather. His ſecond intentiō was to treat therof in regard of placing each thing in due order, in his ranke of ten Predicaments, or ſhew their relation therunto; and for this cauſe in his firſt Treatiſe vpon the ſaid Predicaments, he maketh that notorious diuiſion of wordes, ſo well knowne vnto Logitians into *AEquiuoca, Vniuoca & Denominatiua*, ſaying thoſe thinges are Equiuocall which doe agree only in name, but are different in nature and dennition, according to that name, as a liuing and painted man doe agree only in the name of a man, but not in nature, eſſence, ſubſtance or definition; and the like may be ſaid in the word *dog ge* before mentioned.

Homónyma légetai, hôn 'ónoma mónon koinòn, hò dè katà t'ónoma lógos tês 'ousias, héteros &c.

10. Now then wheras our propoſition before mentioned with mentall reſeruation, tendeth not directly to any of theſe two purpoſes intended by *Ariſtotle*; and further hath no doubtfull ſenſe of ſpeach or wordes by nature of the wordes themſelues, or their double or doubtfull ſignifications, but only that it vttereth not all the whole ſenſe of the ſpeaker; it cannot properly be called Equiuocall according to Ariſtotles meaning and definition; but rather in a more large & ample ſignification, as Equiuocall may ſignify an amphibologicall, doubtfull, or double-ſenſed propoſitiō, in reſpect of the ſpeaker and hearer, wherof the one ſometime vnderſtandeth the ſame in one ſenſe, and the other in another. For which cauſe the moſt ancient Schoole-Doctors, Fathers, and other Authors doe vſe in deed rather the word *Amphibology* then *Equiuocation* in expreſsing like kind of ſpeaches as our propoſition is; which of later yeares only hath byn accuſtomed to be vſed in this ſenſe, but the other is moſt ordinary with antiquity, not only among Philoſophers, but alſo (and that eſpecially) among Orators and Rhetoritians, in which ſcience it is held for law-

Of Equiuocation and amphibology how they differ.

full & most commendable in diuers occasions, wher-
Quint lib. in Orator. l. 7. c. 9 of both *Cicero* often maketh mention, and *Quintilian* writeth a whole Chapter The cause then why the answering by such a reserued proposition, as before hath byn mentioned, is called by some *Equiuocation*, is rather by a certain similitude, thē propriety of speach, to wit that euē as Equiuocation properly by community of name in things of different natures by variety of significations in the selfe same wordes or speach, by custome of phrase, and composition of sundry sortes doth make different and doubtfull senses, & meanings to the hearer; so in this case by mentall reseruation of some part of the foresaid mixt proposition, the like effect of doubtfulnes is bred in the hearers vnderstanding, and therby consequently is named Equiuocation, although improperly as Equiuocation is taken for any doubtfull word or speach that may haue diuersity of senses or vnderstandings.

11. But now to inferre herof as T. M. doth in his first Conclusion of this his wise dispute, that euery
Pag. 49. such Equiuocation by mentall reseruation *is a grosse ly*, is not only a *grosse* presumption, but a *grosse* ignorance also in my opinion, not to call it a *grosse* impiety; for by
T. M. first cōclusion. this meanes he might cōdemne of grosse lying a great number of speaches of the holy Ghost, both in the old and new Testament, where diuers propositions are set downe and vttered with imperfect sense, somewhat being reserued which necessarily must be supplied, to saue the said speach from vntruth. As for
Psal. 1. example, where the Prophet saith *Non resurgunt impij in iudicio:* Wicked men doe not rise againe in iugdment: if the Prophet reserued not somewhat in his mind vnuttered, for the complement of this speach, as namely that they shall not rise to glory, as *S. Paul* expoun-
1. Cor. 15. deth it to the *Corinthians* it would seeme an Heresy, & contrary to the article of our creed, *I believe the resurre-*

ction

spirit or life in her, for the excesse of maruaile of that she saw; And againe the same holy Ghost talking of the immensity of Salomons wealth, said: *Tantamq; copiam præbuit argenti in Hierusalem, quasi lapidum*, and Salomon made siluer so plentifull as stones in *Hierusalem*, may a man sweare this without vntruth or prophanation? what say yow *M. Morton*? may a man swear this in your Lordes Court of the *Arches*? & the same I demaund of those last wordes of *S. Iohns* Ghospell; *There are many other thinges which Iesus did, which if they should be particularly written, I doe not thinke that the world it selfe would hold the bookes that should be written therof.*

18. How can this be true *M. Morton* in plaine and literall sense, and without some amphibology or Equiuocation? and yet I thinke yow will not say it is a lye, being part of the Ghospell, or that it may not be sworne without *abhominable prophanation*. How then will yow, or can yow defend it? Truly by no other way, but by the licence of a Rhetoricall figure called HYPERBOLE, which *Quintilian* defining saith, it is *Enientiens superiectio*, a lying exaggeration; and yet will no true Deuine call it a lye indeed, & much lesse periury or prophanation, if any man should sweare it: wherby is made manifest, and apparent the childish vanity of our Aduersary in his former conclusion *that euery verball Equiuocation is an abominable prophanation*. And so much of this second kind of Equiuocation, which yow see how lawfull and vsuall it is, euen in the Scriptures themselues, and in the speaches of our Sauiour which is truth it self; wherby hauing represſed somewhat the insolency and ignorance of this our vaunting Minister, we shall retourne now againe to the first kind of Equiuocation by mentall reseruation, about which is our principall controuersy. And for that our Minister affirmeth two pointes about the same, the first, that it is no proposition at all accor-

Quint. l. 8. inst. orat. cap. 6.

according to the true nature of a propoſition; and the ſecond that it is vntrue morally, & a groſſe ly: we ſhall handle and diſcuſſe theſe two pointes ſeuerally in the two Paragraphes that doe enſue.

THE

14. In theſe other wordes in like manner, *Hoc eſt corpus meum* (about which there is ſo great a doe now throughout Chriſtendome) the Proteſtantes for defending their opinion about the Sacrament, muſt needes grant a verball Equiuocation, trope, figure, & amphibology, wherby they haue a double ſenſe, and one far different from that naturall plaine and common ſignification, which all Catholicks hold throughout the world, which is the ſenſe or ſenſes which they & theirs doe frame of theſe wordes, wherby doth follow in their ſenſe and interpretation that they are Equiuocall, according to the definition of *Ariſtotle*; and yet did Chriſt vſe them in a more ſacred inſtitution of the Sacrament, then was that of an oath; and yet I thinke the impiety of *Thomas Morton* will not reach ſo farre, as to condemne Chriſt of an abhominable prophanation in that his ſacred inſtitution; and conſequently he may ſee that his ſecond generall concluſion was but an inconſiderate, bold, vnlearned, and vntrue aſſertion.

About the vvordes *hoc eſt corpus meum* vvhether they conteine Equiuocatiõ or not.

15. And thus much of this ſecond kind of verball Equiuocation, ſet downe and cenſured by T. M. which indeed is only true and proper Equiuocation, as before hath byn noted (for that mentall in rigour is none) and agreeth only to the definition of Equiuocation, deliuered not only by Philoſophers, but Orators alſo, *Cum pluribus rebus aut etiam hominibus* (ſaith *Quintilian*) *eadem appellatio eſt* HOMONYMÍA, *vt Gallus &c.* When one name agreeth to many thinges or men, it is called Equiuocation, as the word *Gallus* ſignifieth both a French man, or a Cocke, & ſome other thinges; by which definition as alſo by theſe other deſcriptions alledged out of *Ariſtotle* before, is euidently ſeene that the firſt kind of Equiuocation by mentall reſeruation, cannot properly be called Equiuocation but AMPHIBOLOGÍA, ambiguity of

Quint. l. 7. inſt. orat. cap. 1.

speach, which stretcheth larger then doth Equiuocation, and is *Genus* vnto it, as *Quintilian* in the same place affirmeth; and that the second kind, which consisteth principally in the diuersity of significations in wordes or speach (such as before we haue alledged out of our Sauiours speaches) is properly Equiuocation, & consequently he an Equiuocatour in this kind, which *Thomas Morton* saith, that his soule doth so much abhorre and detest.

16. I might moreouer to this purpose for further battering of this fond conclusion of *Thomas Morton*, alledge the vse of all Rhetoricall tropes, and figures, and aske him whether, as they may lawfully be vsed in speach, so likewise in an oath? As for examples when Christ our Sauiour calleth Heretickes & euill Pastors *lupos rapaces*, rauening wolues, which is a trope called a *Metaphor*, may a man sweare it is true? for that in nature they are men and no wolues. And so likewise when *S. Paul* wrote to the *Corinthians* vsing a figure called EIRONEÍA: *Iam saturati estis, iam diuites facti estis, sine nobis regnatis &c.* Now yow are full, now yow are rich, now yow raigne without vs, you are wise, we are fooles, yow are strong, wee are infirme, yow are noble, we are base &c. might *S. Paul* haue sworne this which he writeth without an *abhominable prophanation* of that sacred institution of an oath? I thinke he might, for that often he was accustomed to sweare, that is to say, to call God to witnes, that he spake the truth, and yet heere he cannot be presumed to thinke as he spake, or as the wordes literally doe import: where then is *Thomas Morton* in this his conclusion?

1. Cor. 4.

Ironicall speach a kind of Equiuocation.

17. Againe I would demaund of him whether a man might sweare, without prophanation, that speach of the holy Ghost, concerning the Queene of *Saba*, when she saw the wisedome, riches, & greatnes of *Salomon*, *Non erat vltra in ea spiritus præ stupore*, she had no longer spirit

2. Paral. 9.

THE SECOND PART OF THIS CHAPTER,

VVhether a mixt proposition, partly vttered, and partly reserued in mind, may be a true Logicall Proposition, and Enunciation. §. 1.

HAuing shewed hitherto aswell what Equiuocation and amphibology is; as also that all Equiuocation is not lying, or rather that none is properly or can be lying so long as it remaineth within the nature of Equiuocation (which yet afterward shall better be discussed) and moreouer that simple & verball Equiuocation either in wordes or speach, may be lawfully vsed by any good man, to a good end; yea & sworne also with due circumstances, if need require without periury or prophanation; and that our Sauiour Christ vpon sundry occasions did vse the same: Now we must restraine our talke to the former part of ambiguity, or supposed Equiuocation only, which is by mentall reseruation, to wit (not to depart from our aduersaries example) *I am no Priest, so as I am bound to tell it to yow*; the first part therof being vttered, and

the later reſerued in mind, which ſo much diſpleaſeth *M. Morton* as he would annihilate the ſame, ſaying firſt, *that it is not a hidden truth, but a groſſe ly*, as before yow haue heard in his firſt propoſition, and then, *that it is no propoſition at all, if we reſpect the lawes of Logicke*, which he vttering in the vehemēt heate of his ſpirit, hath theſe
Pag. 54. wordes: Conſult (ſaith he) with the Ancient logi-
» tians, and proue (marke what ſcope I yeald vnto yow)
» that from the beginning of the world, in the whole
» Current of ſo many thouſand generations of man-
» kind, till within the compaſſe of theſe laſt foure hun-
» dred yeares, and leſſe; that euer any Logitian, whe-
» ther Infidell or belieuer, did allow your mixt propoſi-
» tion (which is partly mentall and partly verball) or
» thinke it a propoſition, and I will be (which my ſoule
» vtterly deteſteth) an Equiuocator. So he. And we muſt conſider of this laſt point firſt, and afterward of the reſt; for they are all pregnant as yow ſee.

20. And firſt to beginne with *Thomas Mortons* ſoule, I know not what it doth, or may deteſt in *Equiuocation*, but only perhaps the bare name, therby to ſeeme to contradict vs, ſeing it is ſo frequent in Scripture, as now hath byn ſaid, and after ſhall be more amply proued: but ſure I am that, that *ſoule of his* deteſteth not lying, as by manifold examples hath appeared, and conſequently it were ſinne to admit him for an *Equiuocator*, for he would infame the lawfull vſe therof; for that Equiuocation can not ſtand with lying, as in the enſuing Paragraph ſhall manifeſtly be proued.

Thomas Mortons ſoule deteſteth Equiuocation, but not lying.

21. Secondly is to be conſidered in theſe his wordes the *large ſcope which he giueth vs, to proue from the beginning of the world, in the whole Current of ſo many thouſand generations of mankind, that any Logitian held our mixt propoſition for a propoſition &c.* Wherin I would aske him firſt, what he meaneth by the *Cnrrent of ſo many thouſand generations of mankind*, or how many thouſandes he thinketh

keth them to be since Logicke was first inuented, or brought into arte, which before *Aristotles* time was either litle, or imperfect, though he confesseth in his *Elenches* that *Tisias* after those that went before him, & *Thrasimachus* after *Tisias*, and after him againe *Theodorus* had collected some obseruatiõs; but how many thousand generations will *Thomas Morton* haue past from that time to ours? *S. Matthew* in the beginning of his Ghospell recounting the whole current of generatiõs that had runne from *Abraham* vnto Christ, which were more then from *Aristotles* time to ours, saith they were but forty and two in all, to wit, fourteene from *Abraham* to *Dauid*, fourteene from *Dauid* to the transmigration of *Babilon*, & fourteene from thence to Christ; and where then are so many thousand generations of *Thomas Morton*? Is not this a very childish ouerlashing?

Arist. l. 2. Elench. c. 8

T. M. his erroneous account of generations. Math. 1.

22. But there followeth another simplicity much more notorious: *Consult* (saith he) *from the beginning of the world, till within the compasse of these late foure hundred yeares, and lesse, that euer any Logitian, whether Infidell, or belieue did allow your mixt proposition, or thinke it a proposition, and I will be an Equiuocater*; By which wordes yow see that he excepteth against the Iudgment of all the Logitians that haue liued within the compasse of these last foure hundred yeares for triall, whether this sort of mixt proposition be a true lawfull proposition or no, according to the rules of Logicke; which if yow consider it well, is one of the most solemne fooleries that euer man of learning could vtter. For if he had excepted only against them, and their iudgment *in genere moris* that is to say, for triall, whether the proposition before mentioned be true morally, or in morall truth, as it is opposite to lying; though it had byn presumption to preferre therin his owne weake iudgment before so many great and learned Deuines, and Philosophers as haue liued, and written in the

The foolish insolency of T. Mortō.

time by him aſsigned: yet had it byn leſſe maruaile, as proceeding from the ordinary pride of an Hereticall humour, exalting it ſelfe aboue all in ſuch affaires; but to reiect them all in the art of Logicke, as not able to iudge whether a mixt propoſition be a true Logicall propoſition, according to the rules of that ſcience, wherin they were moſt exact, and eminent, and are knowne to haue byn the chiefe, & almoſt only Commentatours and expoſitours vpon *Ariſtotle* in that behalfe; this (I ſay) is ſupereminent folly. For what? Did *Albertus Magnus*, *S. Thomas* of *Aquin*, and ſo many others of that ranke know logicke? Or to omit externe writers, did our famous Countreymen, *Alexander* of *Hales*, *Scotus*, *Burley*, *Middleton*, *Occham* and others know Logicke? If they did, why doth *Thomas Morton* except againſt them all in this ſcience? If they did not, how did they write ſo many large and learned Treatiſes therof? And for proofe I referre him to the laſt named *VVilliam Occham* his famous Logicke intituled: *Summa totius Logicæ Magiſtri Gulielmi Occhami Anglici, Logicorum argutiſſimi &c.* And he ſhall find therin more Logicke then he vnderſtandeth, and more iudgment then he can conceaue.

23. But to leaue this, and to examine the matter about this propoſition out of his *Oracle* of Logitians himſelfe, the ſaid *Oracle* in his firſt booke of *Reſolutions*, intending to ſet downe the laws of a good ſillogiſme, wherof propoſitions are the partes, defineth a propoſition thus: *Propoſitio eſt Oratio affirmatiua, vel negatiua alicuius de aliquo*: A propoſition is a ſpeach which doth affirme, or deny any thing of another. As for example (not to depart from the argumēt of *M. Mortons* ſpeach) *I haue a Prieſt at home, or I haue no Prieſt at home*, the one is a propoſition affirmatiue, the other negatiue, of which ſort of propoſitions *Ariſtotle* according to the matter, or ſubiect he handleth, aſsigneth diuers diuiſions,

Ariſt. l. 1. Prior reſolut. c. 1.

Prótasis mèn 'estì lógos kataphatikòs, 'è 'apophatikòs, tinòs katá tinos.

sions, as heere in this place, he first deuideth it into *Vniuersall*, *Particular*, and *Indefinite*; and then againe into *Syllogisticall*, *Demonstratiue*, and *Dialecticall*, and in his Topickes into *Morall*, *Naturall* & *Rationall*; but for so much as appertaineth to our matter in hand, it shall be sufficient to note this diuision following, that some propositions be mental only, that is to say, conceyued only in our mind, and affirming, or denying any thing therin, as if they were vttered: and so according to all Deuines there may be mentall Heresy, when a man in his mind doth affirme, or giue consent to any Heresy in his hart, for the which he may be damned euerlastingly, if he repent not, though he should neuer vtter the same in word or writing to any. And in like sort Christ our Sauiour saith in the Ghospell, that there may be mentall adultery, when a man giueth consent of mind to his concupiscéce, though he commit not the externall act therof.

Lib. 1. Topicor. c. 12.

Diuers diuisions of propositions.

A mentall proposition.

Math. 5.

24. And now that this mentall proposition, is a true proposition in the nature of a proposition (though not altogeather such as *Aristotle* treateth of *in ordine ad syllogismum*, in order to make a sillogisme, as after shall be declared) is euident; for that it affirmeth or denieth, consenteth or dissenteth to somewhat in the mind: nor can any man doubt with reason, but that there is a mentall speach, aswell as verball. And *Aristotle* himselfe affirmeth it, when he saith: *Ea quæ sunt in voce, earum quæ sunt in anima passionum notæ, & ea quæ scribuntur, eorum quæ sunt in voce*, those thinges which are vttered in speach are notes and signes of those thinges which are in the mind, as those things that are written are notes of that which is spoken. So that according to *Aristotle*, as the externall writing representeth vnto vs a mans speach, so the externall speach representeth vnto vs the internall speach, affection, or asseueration of the mind. Wherfore of this there can be no controuersy,

Arist. l. de interpretat. cap. 1.

'Estì mèn tà 'en tê phoonê tôn 'en tê psychê pathemátoon symbola· kai tà

graphómena tôn 'en tệ phoonệ.

but that there is a true internall ſpeach of the mind, affirming or denying, approuing or reiecting, conſenting or repugning aſwell as in externall ſpeach, and conſequently are there true mentall propoſitions to be graunted and allowed. And in this I thinke *M. Morton* will not ſtand with vs, though we confeſſe as I haue ſaid, that *Ariſtotles* end and purpoſe being in his Logicke to teach vs to diſpute by diſcourſe of *Enthimemes* and *Sillogiſmes*, for attaining of ſciences, he had no vſe of theſe mental propoſitions, as neither of propoſitions by ſignes, or mixt of diuers ſortes; but only nameth the other two that conſiſt in voice or writing, as only making for his purpoſe. But yet we muſt not imagine that he denied the other, which are cleerly proued out of nature, reaſon, and vſe of humaine life and conuerſation.

Fovver ſortes of externall propoſitions.

25. Wherfore the ſecond member of this our diuiſion is, that beſides the foreſaid inward mentall propoſitions, there are externall alſo vttered in diuers manners, ſome by voice, ſome by writing, ſome by ſignes, ſome mixt or compound of diuers ſortes, as to giue example only of this laſt (for that the former are cleere of themſelues:) If a man lying on his death bedde, ſhould ſay before witnes, I giue and bequeath vnto *Thomas Morton &c.* And then his voice fayling him ſhould call for a pen, and write *a thouſand &c.* and then a palſey taking alſo his hand he ſhould point towards an Angell of gold, ſhewing by ſignes that he meant a thouſand ſuch golden angels, I doubt not, but in this caſe Sir *Thomas* being a clerke would ſay in cõſcience (and ſo he might in iuſtice) that all this were but one ſimple affirmatiue propoſition, as if the ſicke man had ſaid, I giue and bequeath to *Thomas Morton* a thouſand angels of gold, though it were vttered by him in three ſeuerall ſortes of propoſitions, *vocall, literall* & *by ſignes*, as hath byn ſhewed.

Diuers ſortes of mixt propoſitions.

26. And

26. And if this be graunted (as needes it muſt) then why ſhould he cry out, as he doth, againſt that other mixt propoſition, that is partly mentall, and partly vocall? why ſhould he deny it to be a true propoſition? If he anſwere for that *Ariſtotle* did not handle any ſuch mixt reſerued propoſitions, he ſaith nothing. For that *Ariſtotles* purpoſe being (as is ſaid) to treate of propoſitions in order only to Sillogiſmes, and argument, it was wholy from his purpoſe to handle any, but ſuch as ſerued to that end, and ſo *Ariſtotle* handled no ſort of mixt propoſitions at all, either reſerued or not reſerued: and yet yow ſee by the former example of him that bequeathed in his Teſtament partly in one, and partly in another, that in the common vſe, trade, and conuerſation of mans life (wherof wee treate) there may bee vſe therof, as in like manner, there is of talking by ſignes, as deafe-men doe, who vtter truly: their mindes by ſignes equiualēt to true propoſitions, affirmatiue or negatiue, and ſo are vnderſtood: and yet *Ariſtotle* treateth of no ſuch, not for that they are not, but for that they appertained not to his purpoſe: of framing ſillogiſmes for attaining of ſcience as hath byn ſaid; for which cauſe alſo he profeſſeth to exclude *deprecatoriam orationem*, all deprecatory ſpeach, and all Rhetoricall, and Poeticall tropes and figures, which yet, as we ſee, are fitly ſometimes vſed not only in the common conuerſation of men, but euen in Scripture it ſelfe, though they be not to the purpoſe of ſyllogiſticall propoſitions which muſt be ſimple, clere, & plaine in their naturall ſignification without tranſlation, figure, ambiguity, or Equiuocation, and conſequently it is no good argument to ſay, that *Ariſtotle* handled not ſuch propoſitions, and therfore they are no propoſitions at all. For that *Ariſtotle* (as hath byn ſaid) reſpected his particuler end of Sillogiſmes, we ours of common conuerſation. But our aduerſary

In morall matters there may be mixt Propoſitions.

Lib. Periher. c. 4.

vrgeth

An obiection anſwered.

vrgeth yet further, and it is the whole force of all he ſaith, that this mixt propoſition partly vocall, and partly mentall, to wit, I *am no Prieſt*, with reſeruation of the other part, *ſo as I am bound to vtter the ſame to yow*, can be no true logical propoſition: for that according to Ariſtotle, *Euery propoſition is enunciatiue, that is to ſay, it is ordained for ſignification to expreſſe ſome thing, but no mentall or inward conceipt of the mind is ordained by God* (ſaith he) *as a ſigne to expreſſe, or ſignify as wordes, and writinges doe &c.*

Conf. p. 56

27. Wherto I anſwere, graunting that euery propoſition muſt be *Enuntiatiue*, that is to ſay (as before hath byn out of *Ariſtotle* declared) it muſt affirme or deny ſomewhat, true or falſe; but this is not done only by externall voice or writing (though *Ariſtotle* for the cauſes aboue mentioned, doe only name thoſe two wayes) but by ſignes in like manner as hath byn declared, and much more by internall actions and operations of the mind, which according to all Philoſophers are three, the firſt ſimple apprehenſion of any thing; the ſecõd affirmation or negation of the ſame; the third diſcourſe, when one thing is inferred of an other, as in arguing or diſputing, as *this is ſo*, ergo *the other is, or is not ſo*. And to the firſt of theſe three inward operations of the mind and vnderſtanding, doe anſwere outwardly three externall effectes, as to the firſt ſimple wordes, or ſpeach, without affirming or denying, as in definitions without the verbe for examples ſake, *animal rationale mortale &c.* all which is nothing els but ſimple apprehenſion of the thing, without diuiſion, compoſition or diſcourſe. To the ſecond operation doe anſwere compoſition and diuiſion, to wit affirmations and negations: and to the third *Enthimemes* and *Sillogiſmes*, that by diſcourſe doe inferre one thing of another; ſo as in our mind there paſſeth no leſſe then in our outward ſpeach, voice, writing or ſignes,

Lib. de interp. c. 4. & prior. lib. 1. c. 1.

Lógos 'apophãtikòs 'en hô, tò aleetheúein 'eè pseúdesthai hypárchei.

Three internall operations of the mind.

signes, but rather more, for that as *Aristotle* before saith, these outward actions, are but signes of that which passeth within. So as albeit the one part of a reserued mixt proposition, doth not *enunciare aliquid ad extra*, expresse any thing outwardly to the hearer; yet it doth inwardly to the speaker. And if it be vrged that it must be *vox*, according to *Aristotle*, I answere, that as there is a voice in writing as well as in speaking, according to *Aristotle* himselfe, so is there an internall voice, as well as an externall, and an internall speach as well as an externall, which speaketh, affirmeth, or denieth to the inward eares as well or better then the voice, or letter to the outward; which is sufficient to correspond to the Logicall definition of a proposition, euen according to *Aristotles* rule, though (as hath byn said) he defined properly externall voices only, and propositions consisting in speach or writing. 1. *Perihermen. cap. 1.*

28. But our Minister will insist that it is not *enuntiatiue* or significant to the hearer: Wherto I answere, that the definition of a proposition or enuntiation nameth not the hearer, but that it be of his owne nature *enunciatiue*, affirming some thing true or false, whether the hearer vnderstand it or no. For when a man talketh to himselfe, though those that stand by vnderstand him not; yet is his speach *enunciatiue*, for that it affirmeth or denieth somewhat true or false of his owne nature, though no man heare, as when a man speaketh to God, or with himselfe, or with men also if one should vtter a proposition in Greeke or Hebrew, which the hearer vnderstandeth not, shall not the proposition be *enunciatiue*, or a true proposition for that the Auditor vnderstandeth it not? When Christ our Sauiour spake many high thinges of his diuinity, humanity, passion, resurrection, and other Mysteries which the Scripture saith that his disciples vnderstood not, shal we say that his speach was not *enuntiatiue*, Luc. 18.

That a mixt reserued proposition is enuntiatiue.

tiatiue, or his propositions no true propositions in Logicke? What will T. M. say to that prediction against the obstinate Iewes, *They shall heare with their eares, and shall not vnderstand &c.* Meaning principally of the preachinges of the *Apostles*, will yow lay the fault that the *Apostles* speach was not *enuntiatiue* or significant, for that the Iewes did not vnderstand the same. Hence then appeareth, that it dependeth not of the hearer to make the speach *enuntiatiue*, or not, but it is sufficient that it be so of it selfe, and of his owne nature.

Math. 13. Ibid cap. 16 & 17. Marc 4. & 6. Luc. 2. & 8. & 18.

29. And so now to apply all this to our owne purpose in hand, this proposition wherof part is vttered in voice, and part reserued in mind, being but one simple propositiō, denying, *that I am a Priest, with obligation to vtter the same*, is truly *enuntiatiue* of it selfe, though the hearer vnderstand not all, but one part therof only, and consequently it is truly and properly a proposition, euen according to the rules of Logicke, for that *Aristotles* definition agreeth therunto which our Minister before so confidently denied.

30. But now heere lastly he may seeme perhaps to make some doubt whether this mixt propositiō partly vttered, and partly reserued be one single proposition, or no, wherof yet in reason there cā be no doubt; for that heere is but only one single enunciation in the mind of the speaker, to wit, that he is no Priest with obligation to vtter the same; heere is but one only simple negatiue *enuntiation* depending of one only *verbe* and negation that denieth me to be a Priest with that obligation, which is the thing appointed by *Aristotle* to make a perfect enuntiation or proposition, which may be proued also by this example: If I should vtter those wordes of the Scripture, *Pater meus maior me est*, My Father is greater then I, reseruing in my mind those other that I affirme them *according to the sense and meaning that Arrius had*, I should incurre Heresy and be damned

VVhether a mixt propositiō be one only propositiō.

Ioan. 10.

damned for this proposition, but not for the former part, for that they are wordes of Scripture, nor for the later alone that are reserued; for that they affirme or deny nothing of themselues, as hauing no *verbe*; and therfore they must cõdemne me as part of the former, and consequently all maketh but one single propositiõ. For that for the first operation of our mind only, which is simple apprehension without affirmatiõ, or negation, God condemneth no man, there being no consent at all therin, and consequently no merit nor demerit, but only in the second and third operations before specified.

31. And to this effect that the two partes of these and like propositions, the one partly vttered and partly reserued doe make but one single and simple propositiõ, we might alleage many other proofes, both by reasons, and examples. By reasons, for that they answere but to one only conceipt of the speakers mind that they conteine but one only negatiue assertion, to wit, that *I am no such Priest, as I meane*, and finally that they haue but one *subiectum*, one *copula*, and one *prædicatum* (Logitians know what I meane:) for the *subiectum* wherof all is affirmed *is I*, the *copula* that ioineth togeather is the verbe *am*, and all the rest is the *prædicatum*, wherfore it cannot be diuers but one only propositiõ. Proued by logicall reason to be one propositiõ.

32. By examples the same may be confirmed diuers wayes, I meane both by prophane, and diuine. As first, if one should make an interrogation, & the other answere, all in effect is but one propositiõ: as if one should say to a seruant, *Is your maister at home?* And he answere, *no*, it were in effect but one only propositiõ equiualent to this, *my maister is not at home*; yea though the one part were vttered in signes only and the other in voice, or writing; as if the seruant should answere only by a shrugge of the shoulders, or by shaking

king his head, as in *Italy* they are wont, to expreſſe a negatiue.

33. But this is ſomwhat more perſpicuous if the anſwere be ambiguous, as when *Cicero* was demanded by his aduerſary in the cauſe of *Clodius* ſlaine by *Milo*, whome he defended, what time of the day *Clodius* was ſlaine, to wit before noone or after, thinking therby to intrappe *Milo*, *Tully* anſwered *ſerò*, which word ſignifying both *towardes the Euening* as alſo *to late*, *Cicero* meant in the ſecond ſenſe, to wit, that he was ſlaine *to late*, hauing deſerued to haue byn ſlaine ſooner, ſo as this only word *ſerò* conteineth the force of a whole propoſition in the ſenſe of the ſpeaker, though not of the hearer.

Two doubtfull anſwers of Cicero.

34. And the like anſwere was that of the ſame Orator to a baſe fellow that hauing byn a cooke came after by riches to pretend an office in the commonwealth, and asked of *Cicero* whether he alſo among others that were to giue their voices would fauour him therin? wherunto he anſwered, *Immò, Ego quoque tibi iure fauebo*, which anſwere hauing two ſenſes by reaſon of the wordes *quoque* and *iure*, the hearer tooke it in the better ſenſe, *that he alſo would of right fauour him*; but the ſpeaker meant, *that he would ſhew him fauour due to a cooke* with a meſſe of pottage, and yet did not this reſerued ſenſe make it two propoſitions but one.

See Quint. l. 6. Inſtit. Orat. c. 4. & Donat. in comēt. in Adelphos Ter.

Ego Coque tibi iure fauebo.

35. And finally I might alleadge all the examples that Orators doe vſe and preſcribe vnder the figure called by *Cicero*, *Reticentia*, and by the *Grecians* APOSIÓPESIS, as *Quid plura?* What ſhall I ſay more, or what ſhall I complaine more? which verbes ſay, complaine, or the like were reſerued in mind by the ſpeaker, and yet is it but one propoſition; ſo that of *Virgil*, *Quos Ego; ſed motos præſtat &c.* Whome I, if I had them in my handes, would &c. All which later part is reſerued in the mind of the ſpeaker, and yet it maketh

Virgil AEnead. 1

but

but one proposition with the rest that is expressed. And thus much of prophane examples.

36. But if we would alleadge all the diuine that might be cited out of the Scriptures, there would be no end, as that among other before mentioned out of the Psalme: *Impij non resurgent in iudicio*, wicked men shall not rise againe in iudgment, which though it seeme a whole proposition; yet is it in deed but a part, and the other part was reserued in the Prophets mind, and expounded afterward by *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians* saying: *Omnes resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur:* We shall all rise againe, but all shall not be changed into glory, and how doe I know that these later wordes were reserued in the Prophets mind? for that otherwise his other wordes that were vttered should conteine an Heresy against the article of our Creed, *I believe the resurrection of the dead*, wherof is inferred that those wordes vttered, with the other reserued, made but one only simple and single proposition.

Diuine examples.

Psal. 1.

1. Cor. 15.

37. In like manner when our Sauiour said to those negligent virgins that came to late, *Non noui vos*, I know yow not, it made but one negatiue proposition, with other wordes reserued in his mind, to wit, *vt saluem vos &c.* I know yow not amongst mine to saue yow, or the like. And how know wee that these or like wordes were reserued in Christes mind? For that the other alone had byn imperfect and false, for he knew them better, then they knew themselues, but he knew them not as his, and so was all but one proposition, or *enunciation negatiue*. And to deny that this was a true *enunciatiue proposition*, for that one part was reserued in the mind, and another vttered, is against all truth and reason, as now we haue declared, and might further by infinite examples, but that a few doe shew the force of the rest, and diuers of these examples out of Scriptures will come more fitly to haue

Math. 25.

their place in the ſequent Paragraphe.

The conclusion of this paragraph.

38. Wherfore to end that which now we haue in hand, wee ſee with what confident ignorance, or ignorant confidence *Thomas Morton* did ſo reſolutly before tell, and promiſe vs, that if throughout *ſo many thouſand generations of mankind any Logitian whether infidell, or belieuer did allow a mixt propoſition partly mentall, and partly verball*, he would againſt the deteſtation of his owne ſoule to the contrary, *be an Equiuocator*: which if it be now proued a ſimple Hypocriſy, then may that ſinfull ſoule of his begin rather to deteſt lying then Equiuocating, which may ſtand with truth, as now more largely we are to demonſtrate.

THE

THE THIRD PART OF THIS CHAPTER,

VVhether the former mixt propoſition partly vttered, and partly reſerued be a ly, or no? §. 2.

NOw come we to the chiefe point of this controuerſy to diſcuſſe whether the foreſaid reſerued propoſition be truly, and properly a lye, or no. Hitherto we haue handled that which leſſe imported, whether it be properly Equiuocation, and properly a true and logicall propoſition, and therin diſcouered the ſmall ſubſtance and vaine cauillations of our Aduerſary: but now we muſt examine that which is of chiefe importance, whether it be a ly, periury, deceipt, falſhood; and finally whether it be ſinne or no, to vſe the ſame in any caſe, or for any cauſe whatſoeuer; for that our Aduerſary *Thomas Morton* his concluſion is both arrogant, and vniuerſall, as before yow haue heard: *Our firſt concluſion* (ſaith he) *is, that euery Equiuocation by mentall reſeruation is not a hidden truth, but a groſſe ly.* Pag. 49. Now with what rigour and ſeueritty our Catholike doctrine doth condemne and deteſt lying, euen in the leaſt

least degree therof, we haue declared partly in the former Chapter, and for clearing the matter more in this place, it will be necessary to set downe briefly both the definitions of truth, falsity, lying, periury, deceipt, and the like, & then to consider, whether our former proposition doe incurre any of the foresaid imputations, or no?

The definition of truth.

40. And first of all this word *Truth* is defined in different manner by diuers Philosophers, as also ancient Fathers, and namely by *S. Augustine*, *S. Anselme*, *S. Hilary* and others, who haue written of this matter. And *S. Augustine* in diuers places of his workes, and namely in his bookes *De soliloquiis, & de vera religione*. *S. Anselme* also hath written a speciall booke *De veritate*, and it is a question, as yow know, that *Pilate* proposed vnto our Sauiour in his iudgment, but had so little care of the resolution therof, as he would not stand to expect the answere; wherfore *S. Thomas* gathereth out of the said Authors diuers definitions, and before him againe our learned Countreyman *Halensis* gathereth eight, and holdeth that euery one of them is true in a seuerall sense, some as they respect God, the first truth & measure of truth; some as they respect mans vnderstanding; some the thinges themselues; of all which number of definitions, two seeme to me most cleare, and effectuall, one of *S. Augustine*, *Veritas est qua ostenditur id quod est*; Truth is that, wherby is shewed that which is in deed, to wit in the vnderstanding, as *S. Thomas* interpreteth, saying, that *Veritas principaliter est in intellectu, secundariò verò in rebus*: Truth consisteth principally in the mind and vnderstanding, and secondarily in the thinges themselues, for which cause he approueth wel this other definition set downe by a Philosopher, *Veritas est adæquatio rei, & intellectus*; Truth is an equalling of the thing it selfe with mans vnderstanding, that is to say, when a man vnderstandeth a thing as it is in

Aug. lib. 5. & de inceps c. 36.

Ioan. 18.

D. Tho. 1. quæst. 16. art. 1.

Halens. 1. part. summæ q. 15. par. 3.

is in it ſelfe, and the thing in it ſelf is in deed as it is vnderſtood, then is it truth, and when this is not obſerued riſeth falſity.

41. For better vnderſtanding wherof we muſt conſider three ſortes or degrees, as it were, of truth, and conſequently as many of falſity; for that as the Philoſopher ſaith *Contrariorum eadem eſt diſciplina*, the ſelfe ſame diſcipline or methood is to be held in contraries, let vs treate then of truth and falſity, as it is vttered in ſpeach, for this is to our purpoſe, for examining of truth or falſity in our foreſaid mixt propoſition. 3 Sortes or degrees of Truth. *Ariſt. l. 1. topicor. c. 8*

42. The firſt ſort or kind of truth is when that which is ſpoken is conforme to the thing it ſelfe, though not to the mind of the ſpeaker; as if one ſhould ſay *my Father is dead*, if he be dead, though the ſpeaker thinke not ſo, then is this ſpeach conforme to the thing, and it is truth in this firſt kind. 1.

43. The ſecond ſort of truth is, when our ſpeach is conforme to our vnderſtanding, though not to the thing it ſelfe; as If I thinking that my Father is dead, ſhould ſay ſo, though he be not dead in deed, yet is it truth in reſpect of my vnderſtanding, though in reſpect of the thing it ſelfe it be not ſo; and in this ſort may a man ſpeake falſe without a ly. 2.

44. The third ſort is when our ſpeach agreeth both with the one, and the other, and is conforme both to our vnderſtanding and the thing it ſelfe; as when I ſay, *that my Father is dead*, and do thinke ſo, and it is ſo in deed; and this is the moſt perfect kind of truth in ſpeach, when there is an adequation of the ſpeakers vnderſtanding with the thing ſpoken, as the former definition preſcribed. 3.

45. And in contrary manner, there are three ſortes of falſity, correſpondent to theſe three ſortes of truth, the firſt called *materia*, material only, when our ſpeach is not conforme to the thing ſpoken, though it be a- 3. Sortes of falſities.

greable to the vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker. The ſecond, a formall falſity, when the ſpeach agreeth not with the mind or meaning of the ſpeaker, though it doe with the thing meant or ſpoken. The third is when the ſpeach agreeth neither with the vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker, nor with the thing it ſelfe, & this is a complete falſity, as if my Father not being dead, nor I thinking him to be dead, ſhould ſay notwithſtanding he is dead, and theſe two laſt kindes of falſity, or either of them doe make a ly, and not the firſt kind alone, for that the eſſence and formality of a ly requireth that the ſpeach doe diſagree from the mind and vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker: in which ſenſe *S. Auguſtine* ſaith, *Non facit linguam ream niſi mens rea*, Nothing maketh the tongue guilty of a ly, but a guilty mind, meaning one thing and ſpeaking another.

Aug. ſer. 28. de ver. Apoſtoli.

46. And this ſame diſtinction of truth and falſity is ſet downe by *S. Anſelme* in other wordes, thus: *Sicut eſt veritas triplex, rei, cognitionis, & ſignationis, ſic etiam eſt falſitas triplex, rei, cognitionis & ſignationis, ſeu enunciationis*: As there are three kinds of truth, one of the thing it ſelfe, another of the inward vnderſtanding, and a third of outward ſignification, ſo is there likewiſe a triple falſity of the thing it ſelfe, of the knowledge or vnderſtanding, and of ſignification or enunciation. The firſt is in the thinges, the ſecond is in our mind, the third in the voice or ſigne that vttereth: wherof he that will ſee more, let him read our foreſaid learned Countreyman *Alexander* of *Hales* in the firſt Part of his *Theologicall Summe* in his ſixteene queſtion of falſity, and firſt member.

Anſel. in dialogo de veritate cap. 2.

47. And heerby it appeareth that *mendacium*, a ly, is a particuler *ſpecies* or kind of falſity, in ſo much as euery ſpeach that is falſe, is no ly, but only that which hath the eſſentiall point before mentioned of diſſenting from the mind and vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker. For

if I

if I thinking, as hath byn ſaid, *that my Father is dead*, ſhould ſay ſo, though he were not dead, yet I make no lye, but only materially, which may be without any ſinne at all, and hereupon are there diuers definitions, and deſcriptions ſet downe by Doctors, and holy Fathers of lyes, and lying: firſt *S. Auguſtine* defineth thus a lye: *Mendacium eſt falſa vocis ſignificatio, cum intentione fallendi:* A lye is a falſe ſignification of ſpeach, with intention to deceaue. In which definition or deſcription rather *Thomas Morton* doth interprete, that by the word *vox*, as the moſt vſuall and principall ſigne, wherby mans mind is vttered, *S. Augnſtine* doth meane all kindes of ſignes, or ſignification whatſoeuer, either by word, writing, ſignes, or actions: for that a man may lye alſo in factes, as he proueth out of the Philoſopher, in his Moralles, and *S. Ambroſe* wordes are cleere: *Non ſolùm in falſis verbis, ſed etiam in ſimulatis operibus mendacium eſt:* A lye conſiſteth not only in falſe wordes, but alſo in feigned workes; though this in rigour be not ſo much to be called a lye, as diſſimulation. And to the imitation of this definition of *S. Auguſtine*, doe Schoole Doctors frame diuers definitions to the ſame effect, as the *Maiſter* of the *Sentences* firſt out of *S. Auguſtine: Mentiri eſt contra mentem ire*, to lye is to goe againſt a mans owne mind and vnderſtanding: and then againe of himſelfe: *Mentiri eſt loqui contra hoc quod animo quis ſentit, ſiue illud verum ſit, ſiue non;* To lye is to ſpeake againſt that which a man thinketh in his mind, whether it be true, or falſe: For albeit he ſhould ſpake a truth thinking that it is falſe, he ſhould lye, as on the contrary ſide, he that ſhould ſpeake that which is falſe, thinking it to be true, ſhould not lye, ſaith *S. Auguſtine*, nor be a deceauer, but deceaued: ſo as the very eſſence of a lye conſiſteth in this that the ſpeaker doe vtter wittingly that which he knoweth to be vntrue, and not in deed meant by him.

Aug. l. de mend. c. 4. & l. cont. mend. c. 12

2. 2. q. 110. art. 1.

Ariſt. 4. Eth. c. 7.

Ambr ſer. de Abrah.

Lib. 3. diſt. 38.

The eſſence of a lye.

Aug. li. de mend. c. 5.

48. And as for the other clauſe *cum intentione fallendi*, with intentiõ to deceaue, *S. Thomas* doth note that it is an effect of lying which is not neceſſary abſolutly to the nature of a lye, but rather as an effect, to the full complement and perfection therof. For that a lye is eſſentially made by that as hath byn ſaid, when a man wittingly & willingly vttereth for truth, that which he knoweth to be falſe, though he ſhould haue no expreſſe intentiõ to deceaue; which deceipt is defined by diuers thus: *Decipere eſt falſam exiſtimationem in alterius animum inducere, diuerſum ab eo, quem habet is qui loquitur*; To deceaue is to ingender in anothers mans mind a falſe exiſtimation, iudgement, or opinion of a thing differẽt from the vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker, which deception if it be in wordes or ſignes only, it is called *dolus* or *fallacia*, guyle or fallacy; but if it be in worke, or deedes, as is buying, ſelling, and the like, it is called *fraus*, fraudulent dealing, wherof *S. Auguſtine* is to be ſeene in his ſecond booke *De doctrina Chriſtiana*, and *S. Thomas* in the ſecond Part of his Summe, where he handleth this matter at large.

D. Tho. 2. 2 q. 110. ar. 1

VVhat deceipt, guile, fraud, and fallacy is.

Aug. li. 2. de doctrina Chriſtiana c. 3.

D. Tho. 2. 2 q. 55. art. 4

49. And now the nature of a lye being thus defined, it is deuided alſo according to the ſaid *S. Auguſtine*, and Schoolemen after him into three kinds or ſortes; The one made out of maglignity to doe ſome hurt, and no good, and it is called a *pernicious lye*; the ſecond to doe ſome man good, and no man hurt, and it is called an *officious lye*; the third that meaneth neither hurt nor good, but is made in ieſt, and is only a *merry lye*. And albeit one of theſe kinds be much more grieuous then the other, as namely the firſt, which of his owne nature is a mortall ſinne, & the other two often veniall; yet are all three euer ſinnes, and neuer willingly to be committted, or permitted in ſpeach or oath for any reſpect whatſoeuer, nor for any mans good temporall or ſpirituall, according to the receaued ſentence of the

Aug. li. de mend. c. 14 & in verba Pſal. 5. Perdes omnes qui loquuntur mendacia.

ſaid

said Doctors, as in the former Chapter hath byn declared.

50. Wherfore to passe on; An oath is when any thing is affirmed with calling God to witnes therunto, which when it is false, and falsely sworne, is a grieuous sinne, named *periury*, for the contempt vsed therin towardes the Maiesty of God, whose testimony is alleadged for the confirmation therof. For auoiding of which heinous sinne, three conditions are required by Schoole-Deuines, as necessary to be obserued according to the admonition of *Hieremy* the Prophet, to wit, *truth*, *iustice* and *necessity*, which latter includeth due circumspection and reuerence.

VVhat an oath is.

See Tolet. l. 4. Instit. ca. 20. 21.

Ier. 4.

51. Now then to apply all this to our present purpose, about the former proposition, *I am no Priest* referuing in mind the other clause, *So as* I *am bound to vtter it vnto yow:* Schoole-Deuines doe easely shew that such a proposition, according to the definitions before set downe, of truth, falsity, deceipt, lying, and periury may be in certaine cases, and with due circumstances truly auouched, and sworne without incurring any sinne at all; and I say *in some cases*, and *with due circumstances*, for that hereupon dependeth much the lawfulnes of the thing. For that if a Priest (for example) should be asked this question by his lawful Superiour or Iudge, to whome the conusans of the thing demaunded, did lawfully appertaine, and that the said Iudge demaunded lawfully, that is say, according to: order of law and iustice; then were he bound vnder paine of mortall sinne to answere truly and directly,: although it were with euident daunger of his owne life, or of others. And this is the common sentence, and iudgement of all Catholicke Schoole Doctors without exception, vnles sometimes the smalnesse of the matter it selfe should in some cases make it veniall, but of his owne nature it is damnable, becaus

The application of the former definitions to our proposition.

Of this see S. Tho. 2.2. q. 69. Silues. verbo accusatio *cap.* 13. &

it is againſt the Maieſty of almighty God, whoſe ſubſtitute euery lawfull Magiſtrate and Iudge is, and againſt publicke iuſtice and the common good of each State and Kingdome, as alſo againſt charity towards our neighbour, and obligation vnto truth it ſelfe. Wherby it followeth, that albeit a mans preſent life or death ſtood vpon it, and that by denying a truth without ſwearing he might ſaue the ſame; yet is it not lawfull to doe it. And this is our ſeuerity in that behalfe.

verbo cõfeſsio criminis q.1 Sotus l.5. de iuſt.q.6 art.1.& 2. Gabr.in 4. diſt.15.q.6 art.2. Angelus verbo cõfeſsio ſecreti.

52. But on the other ſide, if the Iudge be not lawful or competent, or haue not iuriſdiction in that matter which he demandeth: as if a lay Magiſtrate in a Catholicke countrey would enquire of matters not belonging to his iuriſdiction, as for example, ſacred or ſecret; or that he ſhould offer iniury againſt law to the Reſpondent, in the manner of his proceedings, wherby he ſhould be diſobliged in conſcience to anſwere to his meaning or interrogatories, yea ſomtims rather obliged not to anſwer therunto, when it concerneth other mens hurt: then may he * anſwere, as though he were alone, and no man by; for that he hath no neceſſary reference to him at all, nor to his demaundes, queſtions, or ſpeach, but that he may frame to him ſelfe any propoſition that is true in it ſelfe, and in his owne ſenſe & meaning, though the other that heareth vnderſtand it in a different ſenſe and meaning, & be therby deceaued.

Nauar. in manuale c.18.n.57. & c.25.n. 36. Bannes, Arragon & Salon comentar. in S.Tho. 2.2.q.69. & many others.

** This doe hold all the foreſaid Authors and others related by Petr Nau. l.2. de reſtit.cap.4. part. 2. Mich.Sal. 2.2.q.69. art.2.contron.11. Petrus de Arragon & Petrus Bannes vpon the*

53. Neither is this to deceaue another, but to permit him that offreth me iniury, and is no Superiour of mine in that cauſe, to be deceaued by my doubtfull ſpeach, and by concealing that which I am not bound to vtter vnto him: which kind of deceipt or diſsimulation is lawfull, as in the precedent Chapter hath byn ſhewed, by the example of ſtratagemes in warre, wherby though many be ſlaine, and infinite hurtes done;

done; yet *nihil homo iustus* (saith *S. Augustine*) *præterea cogitare debet in his rebus, nisi vt bellum iustum suscipiat, quod cùm susceperit, vtrum aperta pugna vel ex insidiis vicerit, nihil ad iustitiam interest.* A iust man in warre ought to thinke of nothing, but that the warre be iust, that he taketh in hand, which being certaine, it importeth nothing in respect of iustice, whether he get the victory by sleightes, or by open warre. And this he speaketh by occasion of the direction of God vnto *Iosue*, when he taught him what snares and wiles he should vse to intrappe the inhabitantes of the Citty of *Hai*, as he did, to their ruine and destruction: and therby * all Deuines doe inferre, that such dissimularions & stratagemes are lawfull in iust warre, which yet *S. Thomas* doth limite out of *S. Ambrose* to be true, when the parties haue not giuen their word and promise to the contrary: but yet both he, and all other Deuines doe hold that these stratagemes are no lies.

same place & others, as the cõmon consent of al.

Aug. q. 10. in Iosue.

Iosue 8.

**See Henriq. quodl. 15. q. 16. Adrian. in 4. de restit. §. Sed nunc. Victor. relect. de iure belli. nu. 37. and others.*

54. This same point also, that it is lawfull in this sense to deceaue, that is to say, to permit another man to be deceaued by our speach or doinges, so we vtter no lye, is made most manifest by the example of God himselfe, who though, as before hath byn said, he cannot possibly deceaue, or make a lye, no not by the omnipotency of all his power; yet are there manifold places in Scriptures to shew, that at least he permitteth men to be deceaued by words, & factes of his, & of so many holy Patriarches, Prophets, Apostles, and other Saints gouerned by his spirit; yea of his owne Sonne that is the most exact rule of all truth, for otherwise how could so many Heresies arise, which are all commonly founded vpon the euill vnderstanding of some wordes or sentences of our said Sauiour, and his Apostles, or of the Prophetes and Patriarches before them, which yet Christ & the holy Ghost did forsee, togeather with the infinite errores, and hurtes that

D. Tho. 2. 2 q. 4. art. 3. Ambros. li. de offic. cap. 29.

Though God deceaue not yet permitteth to be deceaued.

would

would enſue therof; and yet did not they preuent that deceipt, nor ceaſe to vtter thoſe ſpeaches by which they knew that ſo many would be deceaued: nay as in the former Paragraph hath byn declared, Chriſt our Sauiour ſpake many thinges doubtfull, ambiguous & Equiuocall in themſelues, that had or might haue different meaninges and interpretations; & yet I preſume *Thomas Morton* will not goe about to bring our Sauiours ſaid ſpeaches within the compaſſe of this clauſe of the definitio of a lye, *cum intentione fallendi &c.*

55. Wherfore to returne to the application of both clauſes of this definition of lying to our propoſition, I ſay, that neither of them doe agree therunto, and much leſſe both. Not the former, for that the ſpeach agreeth to the mind, and meaning of the ſpeaker, for that I doe truly and really meane *that I am no Prieſt*, in the ſenſe that I ſpeake it, which may be any that pleaſeth me, or that I liſt to frame to my ſelfe, ſeing I haue no obligation to reſpect any thing what the demaunder ſpeaketh or asketh, for ſo much as he demaundeth me againſt law and equity, ſo as I may meane *that I am no Prieſt*, ſuch *as I ſhould be*, ſuch *as I deſire to be*, ſuch *as is worthy of ſo great an office, and ſacred a function*, ſuch *as he ought to be that occupieth the place of God in gouerning of ſoules*, I am no Prieſt *ſubiect to the demaunder, or obliged to anſwere his demaundes*, or the like: and as if I were alone I might make to my ſelfe this propoſition, *I am no ſuch Prieſt*, and it were true, and not falſe, for that it agreeth as well with my meaning, as with the thing it ſelfe: ſo alſo now is it truly meant and ſpoken in my ſenſe, though not in the hearers, and conſequently the definition of truth before mentioned agreeth therunto, for that there is heere *adaquatio rei & intellectus*, an agreement betweene the thing, and the ſpeakers vnderſtanding, and ſo much for the firſt clauſe of this definition of lying. For as touching examples to proue

The firſt clauſe of a definition of a lye excluded from our propoſition.

proue the verity of like ſpeaches out of holy Scripture they ſhall be alleadged more aboundantly afterward.

56. The ſecond clauſe alſo which is *intentio fallendi*, intention to deceaue, is eaſely excluded from this our propoſitiõ, both by that I haue ſaid before of the lawfulnes of ſtratagemes, when iniuries are offred, and by the forme of Chriſtes owne ſpeaches; as alſo by that notorious diſtinction of *S. Auguſtine* to this purpoſe alleadged, and auerred by *S. Thomas* and other Schoolemen, and related into the Canon law it ſelfe by *Gratian*, to wit: *Aliud eſt celare veritatem, aliud falſum dicere*: It is one thing to conceale a truth, another to ſpeake an vntruth. And againe: *Manifeſtum eſt* (ſaith the ſame Father) *non eſſe culpandum aliquando verum tacere*: It is manifeſt, that it is not reprehenſible ſometimes to conceale the truth. And yet further ſpeaking of the fact of *Abraham*, that deſired his wife to ſay ſhe was his ſiſter, *veritatem* (ſaith he) *voluit celari, non mendacium dici*, his meaning was to haue the truth hidden (to wit, that ſhe was his wife) but not a lye to be ſpoken, for that according to the phraſe of Scripture ſhe might alſo be called his ſiſter, for that ſhe was his brothers daughter, wherupon *S. Thomas* determineth the matter thus: *Verbo mentitur aliquis quando ſignificat quod non eſt, non autem quando tacet quod eſt, quod aliquando licet*: He lieth in word who ſignifieth a thing that is not ſo (to wit in his mind) but he lieth not, that concealeth ſomewhat that is, which ſometimes is lawfull. And againe in another place: *It is not lawfull* (ſaith he) *to make a ly for deliuering another man from any kind of perill or hurt whatſoeuer*, but to conceale prudently a truth by ſome diſſimulation is lawfull, as *S. Auguſtine* in his booke againſt lying doth teſtify. So *S. Thomas*.

The excluſion of the ſecond clauſe in like manner.

Auguſt. in Pſal. 5. v. perdes omnes &c. *& li. 22. contra Fauſt. c. 33. & 36. & quæſt. 26. in Geneſ. Grat. cauſ. 22. q. 2.*

Gen. 12.

D. Tho. 2. 2. q. 111. art. 1

D. Tho. 2. 2. q. 110. art. 3. ad 4.

Aug. li. de mend. c. 10

57. Now then in this our Caſe we doe affirme, that there is no ly or vntruth auouched at all, but only a

concealing of that truth which I am not bound to vtter vnto him, that demaundeth it vniuſtly. For as if *Abraham* had byn demaunded, whether *Sarai* were his ſiſter, he might for concealing that truth which he would not haue knowne, haue anſwered yea, & this truly, & without a ly, according to *S. Auguſtine*, though in another ſenſe then the demaunder meant: So in our caſe, for that *I deny my ſelfe only to be a Prieſt* in that ſenſe, which in my vnderſtanding & meaning is true, and I affirme nothing falſe, or that is not ſo, but only doe conceale ſome certaine truth which, as hath byn ſaid, I am not bound to vtter to him that demandeth, for that I am not his ſubiect in this cauſe, nor he my lawfull iudge; nor if he were, yet doth he not lawfully demaund me, for that the matter in right appertaineth not to his iuriſdiction, as hath byn ſaid: in this caſe (I ſay) my anſwere is lawfull and allowable by all the Catholike Deuines, Lawiers, and Canoniſtes that write of like caſes, as after in a ſeuerall Chapter ſhall more particularly be declared.

58. There remaineth then only in this place to be conſidered whether I in this caſe doe deceaue or no, or haue intention to deceaue according to the ſecond clauſe of the definition of a ly *cum intentione fallendi*, wherin according to that which before hath byn ſet downe, it is euident that my intention is not to deceaue in this propoſitiõ, but to defend my ſelfe againſt the captious, and iniurious demandes of an vnlawfull Iudge, I ſpeaking a truth in it ſelfe according to my meaning, though he taking it otherwiſe is deceaued therby, but without any fault of mine. For as in the examples before mentioned, when our Sauiour ſaid to his Diſciples of Lazarus, *Lazarus ſleepeth*, and they deceiued therwith, anſwered, *If he ſleepe he is ſafe*, Chriſt deceiued them not, but they themſelues vpon his doubtfull wordes. And when the Iewes were deceiued

VVhether in our propoſition there be intention to deceaue

Ioan. 11.

ceiued with those other words of Christ, *Dissolue this Temple and I will build it vp againe in three dayes*, the Sonne of God cannot be truly said to haue deceaued them, for that he spake that which was truth in his owne sense, and permitted only the other to be deceaued: so in the proposed case, the vniust examiners are only permitted to be deceaued, for that the Priest his principall intent is not *intentio fallendi*, intention of deceiuing, as the definition of lying prescribeth, or as *S. Augustine* in another place saith *fallendi cupiditas*, a desire of deceiuing, but rather *euadendi desiderium*, a desire to escape, and defend himselfe. And therfore, as if he should goe to one of himselfe without necessity, and tell him that he is no Priest, he being a Priest, might be argued of lying, for that his principall intent may be supposed to haue byn *cupiditas fallendi*, an appetite of deceiuing; so heere the thing being euident that *primaria respondentis intentio*, the first and principall intention of the answerer is not to hurt or impugne others, but to defend and couer himselfe vnlawfully pressed, as he presumeth, that his defence is by speaking a truth in his owne meaning (which meaning and vnderstanding of the speaker is the chiefe rule and measure of truth, as before yow haue heard:) it followeth euidently, that it can be no ly, nor deception on his part, though by his manner of answering they deceiue themselues, which is not to be imputed to any fault of his. And thus much of this matter in this place; the rest shall be more fully explaned in the Chapter that ensueth. Ioan. 2.

THE TRVTH BEFORE SET DOVVNE IS FVRTHER DEBATED and proued by the assertion of *Schoole-Doctors, Deuines, Lawiers, both Canon and Ciuill,* Reasons, Practice of the Aduersaries; *and by the very instinct of nature it self.*

CHAP. IX.

THat which briefly hath byn auouched in the later end of the precedent Chapter, about the lawfulnes of the former proposition, might be greatly enlarged many waies, if we would stand theron, or handle the same to the satisfaction of learned men; but for that the compasse of this short Treatise beareth it not, and I must haue a care aswell of the capacity of the vulgar Reader as of the more learned: I shall only adde

adde to that which hath byn ſaid, ſome few more perticulars, in ſundry kindes of proofe, fit for the confirmation of our purpoſe; and in the enſuing Chapter lay forth ſome ſpeciall and principall caſes, wherin the ſaid ambiguous Propoſition or Equiuocation may be vſed, wherby I doubt not but that the whole controuerſy will remaine cleere and manifeſt.

The firſt Point about Schoole-Deuines, Doctors *and* Lavviers. §. 1.

2. YOw haue heard in the precedent Chapter, how *Thomas Morton* challenging vs to proue out of Logitians, that our former reſerued propoſition, *I am no Prieſt, with obligation to tell it vnto yow*, is a true Logicall propoſition; he excepted preſently againſt all Logitians for theſe laſt foure hundred years, wherin Logicke moſt floriſhed, and yet he calleth it, *a new-bred hydra* (to wit of foure hundred yeares old by his owne confeſsion,) and addeth further, *Mark what ſcope I yeeld vnto yow*: which if yow marke it well, is a very markable point indeed, for that after *Ariſtotle* (by whoſe rules the ſaid propoſition is proued) he can ſhew I ſuppoſe very few Authors that haue written of that ſcience, vntill within the ſaid foure hundred yeares: wherfore to except thoſe, and yet to call it *ſo large a ſcope*, is a large folly in my opinion. A large folly.

3. And the ſame I ſay of Deuines, which haue written within the ſaid foure hundred yeares, commonly called Schoole-Deuines and Schoole-Doctors, againſt whome he excepteth in like manner, notwithſtanding they be thoſe to whome it belongeth principally to diſcuſſe, examine, and determine this matter, as

afterwardes shall be shewed. And yet as though he had made no such exception, but admitted all kind of writers throughout all times in this matter, he maketh this new ridiculous vaunt: *Shew vs* (saith he) *for your mentall reseruation, but one Father, whether Greeke or Latin, one Pope whether Catholicke or Antichristian, one Author whether learned or vnlearned, who did euer so fancy &c.*

Pag. 71.

4. Wherunto I may answere, that if the maker of this vaunt had had but one dram of discretion, he would neuer haue set downe so many *ones*, to confound himself: for that presently we shall shew so many Fathers, Greeke and Latin to haue allowed of the foresaid speech, as had occasions to handle such Scriptures, as conteine like propositions; and so many Popes to haue approued the same, as haue allowed the said Fathers sentences, or haue liued since the collecting of the Canon Lawes, wherin the said Fathers sentences are aboundantly cited and set downe: and that so many learned, graue & pious Authors *haue byn of this fancy* (if it be a fancy) as haue byn consulted in cases of most moment, that comprehend this controuersy. So as for this Minister to except against foure hundred yeares togeather (which in effect conteineth a graunt of all the learned of that time) and yet to challeng *one Father, one Pope, one Author learned or vnlearned*, sheweth a broken phantasy of an ydle braine indeed.

An idle Phantasy.

5. But now to lay before the Readers eyes some brief consideration what is reiected in the excluſiō of these last foure hundred yeares, about our point in controuersy, it is to be noted, that the science of Deuinity, called by the Greeks Theology, for that it is properly & immediatly about God, & matter belonging vnto God, hath growne frō time to time, according to the growth of mankind, and to the most ordinate and excellent prouidence of almighty God, as *S. Paul* diuinely dis-

ly diſcourſeth in diuers partes of his Epiſtles, which we ſhall heere indeauour to declare by this particuler deduction, that from the beginning of the world vnto the deluge, there paſsing aboue a thouſand and ſix hundred yeares, to wit more then from Chriſt to this time, let downe in Scripture vnder the liues only of ten mẽ, there was no other Theology in all that time, but only by ſpeech and tradition, of Father to ſonne, freind to friend, maiſter to ſcholler, & predeceſſour to ſucceſſour: and from this againe vnto the time of *Abraham*, which was vpon the point of three hundred yeares, the ſame was obſerued: and from him to *Moyſes*, which was aboue other foure hundred yeares, no booke is extant that was written, though in theſe laſt foure hundred yeares from *Abraham* to *Moyſes* God had his ſeuerall people, as is knowne, which were gouerned without any written word at all.

The deduction of Deuinity from age to age.

6. But *Moyſes* hauing written the fiue firſt bookes of the Bible, commonly called the *Pentateuch* ſo many ages after the beginning of the world, and ſundry other holy men diuers bookes and Treatiſes after him againe, vntill the comming of Chriſt; albeit the ſciẽce and ſtudy of Deuinity was much enlarged therby; yet was it barren in a certaine ſort, in reſpect of that: which enſued after vnder Chriſt, in the writinges of the Apoſtles and Apoſtolicke men, and large Commentaries and expoſitions written theron by ſucceeding Chriſtian ages, which in time growing to be ſo many and great volumes, partly of the ſaid expoſitions and explanations of Scriptures, partly of Treatiſes, bookes, and dogmaticall diſcourſes, partly of Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtories, partly of diſcuſsions and determinations of Councelles, both Generall, Nationall, & Prouinciall, and partly finally of reſolutions & decrees of Biſhops & chiefe Paſtors, for directiõ of their flocks, eſpecially of the higheſt that held the Chaire for gouerning

The encreaſe of Chriſtian Deuinity.

uerning and moderating of all the reſt.

7. Theſe thinges (I ſay) growing at length to ſo great a bulke, & manifold multitude of bookes, Treatiſes, tomes, and volumes, as many men had not time to read them ouer, and much leſſe leaſure and iudgement to digeſt or conceaue them, with that diſtinction, order and perſpicuity, which was neceſſary; it pleaſed almighty God, out of his continuall prouidence, for his ſaid Church, to inſpire certaine men aboue foure hundred years paſt, to reduce the ſaid vaſt corpes of Deuinity, to a cleare methode, by drawing all to certaine common places and heades, and by handling and diſcuſsing the ſame ſo punctually, diſtinctly, and perſpicuouſly, as any good wit in ſmall time may come to comprehend the whole, without reading ouer the other ſo many huge volumes as before was neceſſary. And this method was called afterwardes Schoole-Deuinity, for that it did principally conſiſt in diſputation and diſcuſsion of matters exactly, by diſcending into particulers, and diſſoluing all doubtes; wheras the other manner of ſtudy of Scriptures, Fathers, Doctors, Hiſtories, and Councells, ſeuerally remained with the name of poſitiue Deuinity, as contenting it ſelf only with aſſertiue doctrine, without diſputation or further diſcuſsion.

The beginning of Schoole-Deuinity.

Poſitiue Deuinity.

8. The firſt and principall Authors of this method, or methodicall ſtudy is accounted to be *Petrus Lombardus* Biſhop of *Paris*, aboue foure hundred & fifty yeares paſt, who for that he gathered into the foreſaid method of generall heades, all that any way appertained to Deuinity, out of the ſayinges and ſentences of Scriptures and Fathers, deuiding the ſame into foure bookes, and euery booke into ſeuerall diſtinctions, he was called afterwardes the *Maiſter of the ſentences*, and many learned men in enſuing times wrote Commentaries theron, enlarging with great variety of matter,

Maiſter of the ſentences.

the

the ſaid method which he had inuented. Others alſo made ſeuerall Summes of Theology, differēt in name, but in effect to the ſame imitation, wherof may be accounted one of the firſt, our often named learned Countreyman *Alexander* of *Hales* in *Suffolke*, and after him *S. Thomas* of *Aquine*, vpon whome many other learned men, ſince that time haue, and doe vnto this day write large Commentaries. Diuers alſo conſidering that this methodicall ſtudy hath two partes, the one ſpeculatiue, which is handled principally by the exer-: ciſe of our vnderſtanding in diſpute, the other moral, that apperteineth to manners and action of life; ſundry learned men doe betake themſelues principally to this later, as more neceſſary to practice of Chriſtian life, and caſes therin to be reſolued in Conſcience.

Speculatiue and morall Deuinity.

9. And about the very ſame time, or little before, it came to paſſe by the like prouidēce of almighty God, that the ſame method was thought vpon, for reducing the Decrees and Conſtitutions of Councels, Fathers, Biſhops, and Popes, apperteyning to Eccleſiaſticall gouernment (which grew now to be many) vnto like genera! heades, bookes, cauſes, queſtions and Chapters, fo. more facility of comprehending and remembring the ſame, the cheif Author therof being *Gratian*, a learned Monke of *S. Benedicts* Order: which laborious and methodicall compilation approued by Popes at that time, and from time to time afterwards, and expounded by the writinges and Commentaries of many ſkilfull men in that ſcience, is called the Ca-: non-Law, as the other part appertaining to ciuill affaires, deduced from the ancient Imperiall Romane Lawes, is called the Ciuill-law; and both of them concurring togeather, in this our cauſe, with the foreſaid Schoole-Deuinity, and floriſhing more within thes laſt foure hundred yeares then euer before, as yow haue heard; the exception made againſt them all by

Gratian Collector of the Canon lavv.

Canō lavv

Ciuil lavv

this our Minister, must needes be iudged for light, vaine and impertinent.

10. For he that will cast his eyes vpon the face of Christendome, for these last foure hundred yeares, & consider with himselfe that in all these ages, the most eminent renowned men for learning, conscience, and vertue in all those three sciences, or faculties now mentioned, and vnto whome for all doubtes, and difficulties appertayning vnto iustice, equity and truth, recourse was made, as vnto Oracles of their dayes, for the high esteeme they were held in among all men, he (I say) that shall consider this, and with what integrity they dealt in this affaire, and must be presumed to haue dealt according to their skill, for that they were not interessed therin for any temporall respect whatsoeuer; he that shall but thinke of this, & weigh their vniforme and graue resolutions vpon this point, that a man pressed vnlawfully to answere by vniust manner of proceeding, may delude his demaunder, & not answere to his intention but to his owne, will easely see, what differēce there is to be made betweene these mens iudgmentes, and the clamours of a few vnlearned Ministers in this behalfe, that vnderstand not the grounds wheron the other, or themselues doe speake.

A consideration of moment.

11. And to name some few examples; who were accompted more learned Schoole-Deuines in their daies in *France*, *Germany*, and *Flanders*, then the forenamed *Petrus Lombardus* Bishop of *Paris*, Maister of the sentences? *Iohn Gerson* Chancellour of that Vniuersity? *Petrus Paludanus* Patriarch afterward of *Hierusalem*? *Henricus de Gandauo* Archdeacon of *Tornay*? *Gabriel Biel* a very Religious learned man? *Adrianus* that was Maister to the Emperour *Charles* the fift, and after that *Cardinal* and Gouernour of *Spaine* for *Philip* the first, & finally Pope by the name of *Adrian* the sixt? I might name also *Iansenius* Bishop of *Gaunt* in these dayes, and others of our times,

Learned men of France & Flanders that defend Equiuocation.

times, but of these their learned works are extant, and vpon diuers occasions they fauour & defend the lawfulnes of Equiuocation in sundry cases, as in the next Chapter shall be more particulerly declared.

12. In *Italy* & *Sicily* also many might be named both for Schoole-Deuinity, Canon, and Ciuill law, but I shall be contented with them only, whose workes I haue had time to looke vpon for this point, as *Gratian* with his Commentaries, *Pope Innocentius*, *S. Thomas* of *Aquin*, *Cardinal Caïetan*, *Astensis* in his Summe written almost three hundred yeares since, *Angelus de Clauatio*, famous *Siluester*, *Cosmus Filiarcus* Chanon of *Florence*, Abbot and Archbishop *Panormitan*, *Bartolus* & *Baldus* most famous Lawiers. In Italy & Sicily.

13. But of the Spanish Nation many more, as *Didacus Couarruuias* President or Chancellour of *Spaine*, *Martinus Nauarrus* his Maister, both excellent Lawiers; *Dominicus Sotus* Confessour to the Emperour *Charles* the fifth, *Cardinal Tolet*, *Emanuel Roderiquez*, *Ludouicus Lopez*, *Antonius de Corduba*, *Petrus Nauarra*, *Dominicus Bannes* publicke Reader of Deuinity in *Salamanca*, *Michael Salon* Doctor and Professour of the Deuinity-Chaire in *Valentia*, *Petrus de Arragon* publicke Professour of the same science in the foresaid Vniuersity of *Salamanca*, *Gregorius de Valentia*, and *Ioannes Azorius* publicke Readers in *Rome*, all renowned men for learning, science, & conscience, and through whose hands great matters haue passed for direction of iustice and equity both *in foro fori*, and *foro poli*, as Schoolemen speake, both for diuine and humane proceedinges; and yet doe none of all these condemne or deny absolutly the vse of Equiuocation in certaine cases, but doe rather approue and confirme the same, I meane both lawiers and deuines, when they treat vpon these heades following, *de seruando secreto*, of concealing secretes, both knowne in the Sacrament of Confession and otherwise: *de mendacio* In Spaine and the Kingdoms therof.

dacio, of lying: *de iureiurandis*, of ſwearing: *de fraterna correptione & reſtituenda fama*, of brotherly admonition and reſtitution of another mans fame wrongfully taken away: *de Iudice, de Reo, de accuſatore, de teſtibus*: of a Iudge and his office, of the defendant, accuſer, witneſſes and the like, what they may doe or anſwere lawfully in caſes that may occurre.

The titles vnder vvhich Equiuocation is ordinarily handled.

14. Neither are theſe Authors to be accompted as ſingle and ſeparate from the reſt of the learned men of their ages in this point which we handle, but rather are conioined wholy with them, both in iudgment and practice; ſo as what theſe men did define to be lawful, that did others in like manner both mainteine & put in vre in iuſt occaſions, eſpecially if they were of the ſelf ſame order and ranke: So as when for example wee cite *Silueſter, Dominicus Sotus. Caiëtan, Paludanus, Lopez* and *Bannes*, of the order of *S. Dominick* to haue taught this doctrine without reprehenſion of others of the ſame order, we may inferre probably that all or moſt learned men of that Order throughout Chriſtendome are of the ſame opinion. And the like we may inferre of thoſe of *S. Francis* order in reſpect of *Angelus de Clauatio*, *Aſtenſis*, *Antonius de Corduba*, here cited. And the ſame of *S. Auguſtines* order, by *Petrus de Aragon* and *Michael Salon*. And of the moſt ancient and venerable Order of *S. Benedict* conteyning many thouſandes of learned men, by that which *Abbot Panormitan*, and *Gregorius Sayer* our learned Countreyman haue written vpon this matter, and the later more largely then many others. And the like may be inferred of the order of *Ieſuits*, by that which is extant written by *Cardinal Tolet*, *Gregorius de Valentia*, *Emanuel Sà*, *Franciſcus Suarez*, *Ioannes Azorius*, *Ludouicus Molina* and others. So as by theſe few witneſſes we may take a notice of the whole body and corpes of learned men throughout Chriſtendome; for that Lawiers alſo both

Different orders of religious men concurring all in one.

both Ciuill and Canon, that haue written of the foresaid heades, haue conformed themselues to the same doctrine, as lawfull in equity and conscience. And if any haue dissented, it hath byn in particuler cases only, as before in the seauenth Chapter and third Consideration hath byn noted.

15. As for example *Ioannes Genesius Sepulueda* Historiographer of *Charles* the fifth Emperour, whose authority *Thomas Morton* doth often times alledge against vs, though in the principall he make fully with vs in his booke intituled *Theophilus*; *De ratione dicendi testimonium in causis occultorum criminum*; how a man may beare witnes in causes of secret crimes; yet in some cases he dissenteth from the foresaid Authors, holding singuler opinions by himselfe, but yet vpon such groundes as doe indeed confirme the common sentence of the rest, as afterward in due place shalbe declared. *Ioan. Gen. Sepulueda*

16. Wherfore to end this Paragraph about the Cõsideration of Schoole-Deuines and Lawiers, it shall be sufficient to haue named these few, and though I had purposed once to haue set downe in particuler the seuerall places of their workes, where they handle this matter, and shew their opinions in approbation therof; yet finally not to trouble the Reader with so many quotations, I iudged it best to deferre these vnto the next Chapter, where I meane to lay forth some particuler cases in which their seuerall sentences are to be alledged, and so we shall passe on now to the other pointes of his Chapter that doe remaine: only aduertising by the way, that if our few English Ministers that doe contradict this common receaued doctrine (for I doe not thinke all to be so rash or sensles) should be put in a paire of ballance, for learning, piety, and discretion, with these Authors here named, and that a man were to aduenture his soule with one party, I doe not doubt, but that the discreet Reader will

der will easely see where it were reason to make his chose. And so much of this.

THE SECOND POINT
touching Scriptures and Fathers,
For mixt and reserued propositions. §. 2.

17. AND first of all I haue thought best for more breuity, to ioine Scriptures and Fathers togeather, in this Point of mixt and reserued Propositions, for that the exposition of the Fathers going with the text of Scripture, doth euidently shew both their sensses therin, and conioine both their testimonies. For if we can shew that the holy Ghost in Scriptures doth vse such doubtfull and ambiguous propositions as is that, *I am no Priest*, with some mentall reseruation, equall vnto this of ours *with obligation to reueale &c.*) and that by ordinary sound and signification of the wordes vttered, the hearer may be deceaued, and take it in one sense, and the speaker by the part reserued in his mind may truly vnderstand it in another, and that the ancient Fathers doe by their expositions confirme the same, then doe we proue directly our purpose, both out of Scriptures and out of Fathers in like manner, notwithstanding *Thomas Mortons* vaine assertion, *that not one Iota in all Scriptures, not one example in all Catholicke antiquity &c.* And albeit I haue shewed diuers examples already in the two precedent Chapters, that doe conuince most euidently that which we are to proue; yet for that we haue not vrged before the exposition of Fathers vpō those

Pag. 48.

places,

places, we meane heere out of the aboundance that we haue, to adioine ſundry other teſtimonies, to the end the matter may remaine vndoubted.

18. And we ſhall begin with an example ſo cleere, as it ſhall be like to that of ours in all pointes, if we chang only the names of the perſons, and conditions of men that ſpake and heard. As that example of *S. John Baptiſt*, who being examined and demaunded by them that were ſent vnto him from the Iewes, whether he were a Prophet or no, he deined it. *Propheta es tu? Et reſpondit non:* Are yow a Prophet? and he anſwered no; and yet he meant not abſolutly to deny himſelf to be a Prophet, for that it had byn falſe both in reſpect of that his Father *Zacharias* had prophecied of him in his natiuity, *Et tu puer Propheta Altiſſimi vocaberis &c.* And thou child ſhalt be called the Prophet of the Higheſt, for that thou ſhalt goe before his face to prepare his wayes; as alſo for that the teſtimony of Chriſt himſelf in *S. Mathewes* Ghoſpell is cleare, *Quid exiſtis videre? Prophetam? etiam dico vobis & plus quàm Prophetam:* What went yow forth to ſee in the deſert? A Prophet? yea I ſay vnto yow, and more then a Prophet. Wherunto our ſaid Sauiour in *S. Lukes* Ghoſpell addeth, *maior inter natos mulierum Propheta Iohanne Baptiſta nemo eſt*, there is no greater Prophet among the children of women then *Iohn Baptiſt.*

A cleere example out of *S.* Iohn Baptiſt his anſwere.

Ioan. 1.

Luc. 1.

Math. 11.

Luc. 7.

19. Heere then yow ſee a propoſition vttered by the holy Ghoſt, that of it ſelf is ambiguous and of a doubtfull ſenſe, and according to the ordinary ſound and ſenſe of the wordes vttered, ſeemeth falſe, no leſſe then our propoſition *I am no Prieſt.* For as this may be refuted by them that know me to be a Prieſt, and as *Thomas Morton* ſtill vrgeth (though fondly,) is contrary to my knowledge and conſcience, that know my ſelf to be a Prieſt: ſo heer *S. Iohns* deniall, that he is a Prophet, may be refuted by Scripture, and muſt needes be

contrary

S. Iohn had a mentall reſeruation.

contrary to his owne knowledge & conſcience alſo, after *Mortons* manner of vrging, for that he could not but know himſelf to be a Prophet, & is no leſſe ſubiect to the calumniation of lying, then our ſpeech of denying my ſelf to be a Prieſt, except it be ſaued by ſome mentall reſeruation, which he vttered not in wordes.

20. But now what this reſeruation was, is not ſo cleere among ancient Fathers, though all doe agree that there was ſome, & conſequently doe ſtand with vs againſt *Morton*, that ſome ſuch reſeruation may be vſed. And firſt *S. Chriſoſtome*, *S. Cyrill*, *Origen*, *Theophilactus*, *Euthimius*, *Apollinarius*, and other Greek writers doe thinke this reſeruation to haue byn in *S. Iohns* ſpeech, that he was not that great Prophet promiſed in *Deutronomy* to come at the time of the Meſsias, of whome *Moyſes* ſaid: *Thy Lord ſhall raiſe vp vnto thee a Prophet out of thy owne Nation, and among thy owne Brethren, as he hath raiſed me, and him ſhalt thou heare*, meaning of Chriſt himſelf. And their proofe for this is, for that in Greek, the article (*ho*) is ioined with PROPHE'TES, which ſignifieth commonly an excellency, eminency or ſingularity of the thing when it is added: ſo as theſe Fathers will haue *S. Iohns* meaning to be, I am not that eminent and ſinguler Prophet mentioned by *Moyſes*, which indeed as hath byn ſaid was Chriſt himſelf.

Chryſ. ho. 5. yr l. 1. in c. 1. 4. Orig. tom. 7. Theoph. Euthim. & Apoll. in Græca catena.

Deut. 18.

21. But other Fathers, as *S. Auguſtine* and *S. Gregory* doe vnderſtand another reſeruation to haue byn in *S. Iohns* mind, to wit that he was not only a Prophet, but more then a Prophet as Chriſt ſaid of him, & therfore denied himſelf to be a Prophet: As if a Biſhop ſhould deny himſelf to be a Prieſt, for that he is more then a Prieſt. But *Rupertus* and ſome others doe interprete this reſeruation of *S. Iohn* to haue byn that he was no Prophet, by ordinary office to foretell Chriſt as other Prophets did; but only that he was a Prophet in ſpirit and vertue, to ſhew Chriſt preſent: So as heere are

Aug. tract. 4. in Ioan. Gregor. homil. 1.

Rupertus in hunc locum.

diuers

diuers reſeruatiõs diſcouered by theſe Fathers, which doe make the propoſition true, that otherwiſe would be falſe, and conſequently all theſe Fathers doe agree, that there may be a true mixt propoſition, partly vttered and partly reſerued, and therby true in one ſenſe and falſe in another, and one way vnderſtood by the hearer, and another way meant by the ſpeaker, which is properly the Equiuocation that we ſpake of in this place, and is fooliſhly condemned by *Thomas Morton* for groſſe lying.

Expoſitiõ of Fathers for mẽtall reſeruatiõ.

22. And albeit I meane to make a ſeuerall Chapter afterward of his wiſe argumentes that he alledgeth to proue his purpoſe; yet will I not pretermit in this place, to touch one ſolemne foolery of his vſed to cõuince (as he ſaith) the former anſwere *I am no Prieſt*, with the reſeruation, *to tell yow*, of a manifeſt ly. And to performe this, he will needes leaue for a time the Schoole of *Ariſtotle*, and his forme of diſputing, and fall to *Socraticall* demaundes and interrogations. Suffer me (ſaith he) *Socratically* to debate this point with yow, and anſwere me friendly to theſe demaundes. *Queſt.* when being asked whether yow are a Prieſt, yow anſwere no, what ſignification hath this word *no*? *Anſw.* It doth ſignify directly I am no Prieſt. *Queſt.* And yet yow thinke yow are a Prieſt? *Anſw.* Yea I know it. *Queſt.* Wherwith doe yow know it? *Anſw.* By my inward mind and vnderſtanding, my conſcience teſtifying this vnto me. *Queſt.* Can conſcience beare witnes, then can it alſo ſpeake? *Anſw.* It ſpeaketh as verily to my inward ſoule, as my tongue ſpeaketh ſenſibly to your eares &c. *Queſt.* Then will this be as true, that when your cõſcience affirmeth that which your tongue denieth, that your tongue ſpeaketh againſt your conſcience, and this is that which we haue proued to be flat lying: a Concluſion that no art of Equiuocation can poſsibly auoid. Lo heere the victory of

Pag 52.

Socraticall demaundes of T. M.

Thomas Morton, which he might take against *S. Iohn Baptist*, for denying himself to be a Prophet, asmuch as against an English Priest, for answering in such a case, *I am no Priest.*

23. For let vs suppose it had byn as punishable in *Iury* to haue byn a Prophet in *S. Iohns* time, as it is now to be a Priest in *England*, and that he had byn demaunded, as he was by those Priestes and Scribes, whether he were a Prophet or no, & he answering no, I would argue by interrogations, as *Morton* doth, what signification hath this word *no*? And then *S. Iohn* must answere, as *Thomas Morton* answereth for him *I am no Prophet*, which had byn a direct ly in *Mortons* doctrine, for that his tongue denieth the thing which his cõscience testifieth, knowing that he is a Prophet: and will *Morton* stand to this his impious processe against *S. Iohn*, or wil he haue me to tell him his errour, to deliuer *S. Iohn* and our Priest also from his calumniation? Let him know then, that this negatiue *no*, when he saith, *I am no Priest*, doth not fall only vpon the wordes vttered, according to the sense of the hearer; but vpon the whole proposition, as it is in the speakers mind, and meaning: so as whē being asked whether I be a Priest, I answere *no*, the word *no* serueth to my signification, that I am no such Priest, as I am bound to vtter. And so in *S. Iohns* answere, he being demaunded whether he were a Prophet, and answering *no*, his meaning was, that he was no such or such Prophet; so as this negatiue did not signify directly he was no Prophet, as *Morton* would haue it, wherby is fallen to the ground all his Socratical sciẽce in arguing by interrogatories. It may be he desired to giue a tast therby of his fitnes to haue some office of an Examiner against Catholickes, for his sharpe manner of concluding, which now men will see that he little deserueth, but in defect of a better.

The comparison of S. Iohns answere vvith the answere of a Priest.

Mortons errour discouered.

24. I

24. I might alledge heere to this effect and purpoſe, that ambiguous and equiuocall anſwere of the ſaid *S. Iohn* about *Eliæ, Elias es tu?* (ſaid the Phariſes) he anſwered *Non ſum:* Are yow *Elias?* he anſwered, I am not, and yet Chriſt our Sauiour, that is truth it ſelf, ſaith of the ſame *S. Iohn: Si vultis illum recipere, ipſe eſt Elias qui venturus eſt:* If yow will receaue him, he is *Elias* that is to come; and the later wordes make the ſenſe more hard, for that it ſeemeth that he deſcribeth the true *Elias* indeed that was to come. But all the fore alledged Fathers, and others doe agree, that *S. Iohns* negation was true in his reſerued ſenſe, to wit that he was not *Elias* in perſon, as the demaunders tooke him to be, and Chriſtes wordes alſo were true in his reſerued ſenſe, to wit, that he was *Elias* in ſpirit, though not in perſon, without which two reſeruations, neither of their ſpeeches can be verified, & with them they are made doubtfull, ambiguous, and equiuocall to the hearer, but not falſe. So as now in one and the ſelf ſame thing, we haue both Chriſt and *S. Iohn Baptiſt*, for manifeſt witneſſes of amphibology and Equiuocation; & conſequently it is likely that the thing is not ſo *hellish, heathenish, heinous* and *monſtrous*, as *Morton* maketh it; nor is it ſuch groſſe lying, as his firſt lying and vnlearned cõcluſion auoucheth it to be. But let vs goe forward.

Ioan. 1.

Math. 11.

Pag. 48. & 49.

25. The next place ſhall be out of our Sauiours wordes to the Phariſes in *S. Iohns* Ghoſpell, where he ſaith, *Ego non iudico quemquam*, I doe not iudge any man, which propoſition without ſome reſeruation cannot ſtand, for that it ſhould be contrary to many other places of Scripture, as that *Pater omne iudicium dedit filio*, the Father hath giuen all iudgment to his ſonne: and againe in the Actes of the Apoſtles, *S. Peter* auoucheth in his Oration to *Cornelius*, and thoſe that were with him, that God had commaunded him and the reſt of the Apoſtles to teſtify to the whole world, *Quia ipſe eſt*

Ioan. 8.

Ioan. 5.

Act. 10.

qui conſtitutus eſt à Deo Iudex viuorum & mortuorum, that Chriſt is appointed by God, Iudge both of the liuing and the dead, which *S. Paul* confirmeth aſwell to the Romans, as to the Corinthians, that we muſt all ſtand before the tribunall of Chriſt to be iudged by him.

Rom. 14. 2 Cor. 5.

26. So as if we take this propoſitiõ as it lieth written without any mentall reſeruation, it is falſe. For if any man ſhould aske of me whether Ieſus Chriſt be our iudge or no, if I ſhould anſwere *no*, I ſhould ſpeake both falſly and impiouſly; and how then may this negatiue be made true (which as vttered by Chriſt cannot be falſe?) Surely by no way, but by a mentall reſeruation of the ſpeaker Chriſt our Sauiour, which reſeruation the ancient Fathers doe ſeeke after, and lay forth vnto vs in diuers manners. For that *S. Auguſtine*, *S. Bede*, and *Rupertus* in their explication of this place, doe affirme, that the reſeruation was *ſecundum carnem* according to the fleſh; ſo as the whole propoſition was, *I doe iudge no man according to flesh and bloud*, as yow Phariſes doe, for that the wordes of Chriſt immediatly going before were theſe to the Phariſes; *Yow iudge according to the flesh, but I iudge no man*; but other Greeke Fathers *S. Chryſoſtome*, *Leontius*, *Theophilact* and *Euthymius* doe thinke that this cannot ſtand, in reſpect of the wordes immediatly following: *Et ſi iudico ego, iudicium meum verum eſt*, and if I doe iudge any man, my iudgment is true, which ſeemeth ſhould not be ſo, if he ſhould iudge according to fleſh and bloud as the Phariſes did.

Hovv Chriſt is our Iudge and hovv he is not.

In hunc locum.

Ioan. 8.

27. Wherfore theſe Fathers doe propoſe another mentall reſeruation of Chriſt in this matter to wit *in hac vita* in this life, meaning that albeit he hath full authority and power of iudging all; yet that he came not into the world to exerciſe that power in this life, but only to inſtruct, comfort, and ſaue men, reſeruing his

Diuers reſeruations ſought out by the Fathers.

his exercise of iudgment vnto the last day, and in the next world, according to his owne speech in another place, *God hath not sent his Sonne into the world to iudge the world, but that the world should be saued by him.* And yet other Greeke writers as *S. Gregory Nazienzen* and *Elias Cretensis* say, the reseruation to haue byn, as *Christ was: man only*, and of himself he had not power to iudge, but from his Father, according to that his saying; *All power is giuen me in heauen & in earth*, where he acknowledgeth to haue receaued all in gift from his Father. And others doe propose other interpretations and reseruations, but all doe agree in one conformity as yow see, that this proposition of our Sauiour cannot be verified, but only by some mentall reseruation, conteyning more then is vttered. And therfore these Fathers doe acknowledge the vse of mixt reserued propositions, euen in the Sonne of God himself, and consequently also of amphibology or Equiuocation, when need requireth.

Ioan. 3.

Marc. vlt.

28. But let vs see some more examples: when our Sauiour was called to raise from death the Prince or Archsinagoge his daughter, as in *S. Mathew*, *S. Marke* & *S. Lukes* Ghospell is recorded, and he comming to the house, found the people in tumult, weeping, and lamenting for her death, he repressed them saying: *Recedite, non est enim mortua puella, sed dormit*; depart, for that the maid is not dead, but sleepeth; & yet is it certaine that naturally she was dead, by separation of her soule from her body, which is proued both for that the people did know her to be dead, and therfore scoffed at Christ, for saying shee was not dead, but a sleep; as also for that otherwise it had byn no miracle to raise her againe. So as if this proposition be taken strictly as it lieth, without any mentall reseruation by our Sauiour, it cannot be true, neither in it self nor in the sense of the hearers, no more thē in our propositiō,

Math. 9. Marc. 5. Luc. 8.

The example of Christ raising the Archsynagogues daughter.

I am no Priest. For if our Sauiour had byn asked, *Is this maid dead?* and he had answered *no:* this word *no* in the force of *Thomas Mortons Socraticall* argumentation must needes be the negatiue of that which is demaunded, and so, to vse his words, directly to haue signified that she was not dead, which had byn directly false, if it had not byn extended to a further reserued meaning of Christ according to our doctrine, and therby the said answere made true.

29. Which mentall reseruation in our Sauiour, according to *S. Augustines* explication, and of other expositours was, that albeit she was dead in their sight, and vnto humane power: yet vnto him, and vnto his diuine power and will to raise her againe, shee was not dead, but only in a sleep. *Verum dixit Dominus,* (saith *S. Augustine*) *nõ est mortua puella, sed dormit; sed illi, à quo potest excitari.* Christ said truly the maid is not dead, but sleepeth, to wit vnto him, that was able to raise her againe. So as by this reseruation, *S. Augustine* defendeth Christes proposition from falsity, & consequently acknowledgeth such Equiuocatiõ in our Sauiours speech as we treat of. For as Christ being asked whether the maid were dead, and he answering *no*, saith no vntruth, for that the negatiue *no* fell not vpon the wordes vttered only, but vpon his whole meaning, partly vttered, and partly reserued, to wit *that she was not dead* in respect of his power and will to raise her againe: euen so our *no* to that demaund, whether *I be a Priest or no*, falleth not only vpon the wordes vttered or question of the demaunder (for so it should be false) but vpon the whole proposition, as hath byn said, and so it is true.

Aug. serm. de verb. Domi. 44.

Christ his answere conferred with ours.

30. I might alleadge almost innumerable places to this effect, as that of Christ in *S. Iohns* Ghospell speaking of the eating of his flesh: *If any shall eat of this bread, he shall liue forever.* And againe a little after: *He that*

Ioan. 6.

that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my bloud hath life euerlasting: and yet *S. Paul* saith to the contrary, *whosoeuer shall eat this bread or drinke the cup of our Lord vnworthily, shall be guilty of the body and bloud of our Lord*; And further, *he that eateth and drinketh vnworthily, doth eat and drinke his owne iudgment, or condemnation, for that he discerneth not the body of our Lord*. By which wordes of *S. Paul*, it is made manifest, first, that the former wordes of Christ cannot absolutly be true, without some mentall reseruation or restriction in his vnderstanding, for that all eaters of his flesh, & drinkers of his bloud haue not life euerlasting therby, but some rather damnation; & secondly is discouered, what this reseruation was, to wit *dignè*, worthily: as if he had said he that shall eat worthily my flesh and drinke worthily my bloud, shall haue life euerlasting therby, which yet Christ vttered not but reserued the same in his mind, as yow see, and therby left the proposition ambiguous and equiuocall.

31. And in very like manner those other speeches of our Sauiour, *If yow shall aske any thing of my Father in my name, he will giue it to yow*: and yet we see by experience, that many doe aske and receaue not, wherfore somewhat is reserued in Christes mind and meaning; which reseruation *S. Iames* vttereth in these wordes: *Petitis & non accipitis, eò quòd malè petatis*; yow aske & receaue not, for that yow aske not as yow should doe; this mentall reseruation then was in Christs wordes, when he vttered the foresaid generall proposition, to wit, that he which should aske, as he ought to aske, should receaue &c. And so againe those wordes in *S. Marke* Ghospell; *He that shall belieue and be baptized shalbe saued*, the reseruation is, if he belieue according to Christs commaundementes, as after both Christ himself in the end of *S. Mathewes* Ghospell, and *S. Iohn* in his Epistles doe expoũd the same; according to which

Iob 16.

Iac. 4.

Marc. 16.

Other examples.

Math. 28.

Io. epist. 1.

sense

Ioel. 2. sense also, those wordes of the Prophet *Ioel*: *Whosoeuer shall call vpon the name of our Lord, shall be saued*, are expounded by Christ himself, when he saith: Math. 7. *Not euery one that saith, Lord, Lord, shall enter into heauen, but he that doth the will of my Father, that is in heauen*; which reseruation was not vttered, but kept in mind by the Prophet. And all these being mixt propositions, partly of wordes vttered, and partly of further hidden sense reserued, making the part that is vttered doubtfull, ambiguous, and equiuocall, as you see; they doe all determine our controuersy most cleerly, and confound *Mortons* vanity most apparently, that saith, and auoucheth *No one Iota to be found in all Scripture, no one example in all antiquity, for the iust proofe or colour of any such Equiuocation or mixt proposition.*

32. I should vtterly weary my Reader, if I would follow all, or the greatest Part of that which may be sayed in this behalfe, for that alwaies commonly all Prophecies that are minatory and doe threaten punishment, haue still some secret reseruation, if they Isa. 38. repent not: as that of *Isay* to King *Ezechias*: *Hæc dicit Dominus, dispone Domui tuæ, quia morieris tu & non viues*: This saith our Lord, dispose of thy housholde, for thou shall dy, and shalt not liue, and yet he liued fifteene yeares after. If therfore the Prophet had byn demaunded; *shall not* Ezechias *liue any longer?* & he had answered *no*, vpon what had fallen the negatiue *no*? If only vpō the wordes vttered, it had byn false, for he liued longer, but if vpon that togeather with the reseruation in the meaning of the holy Ghost, it was true. And the like may be said of the Prophecy of *Ionas*: *Adhuc quadraginta dies, &* Niniue *subuertetur*; There remaine but fourty dayes before *Niniue* shall be destroyed, & so infinite other places. Wherfore in this *Th. Morton* was greatly ouerseene in making of confident a chaleng, as before yow haue heard.

THE

THE THIRD POINT OF THIS CHAPTER CONCERNING Other Scriptures alleadged, *And pretended to be answered by* Thomas Morton. §. 3.

33. BVt now we must come to a greater conflict, which is to examine how our aduersary hath answered certaine examples out of Scripture, alleadged as he saith, (for I haue not yet seene the writing it selfe) by a Catholicke Treatise in written-hand intercepted, wherby the lawfulnes of this kind of Equiuocation is auouched, & by his answere to those that are cited by himselfe, we may imagine what he will be able to say to these other which haue byn here produced by vs, and innumerable others that might be alleadged.

Examples out of the old Testament.

First then out of the old Testament, he produceth two examples only, the one of *Iacob*, that told his Father that he was his eldest sonne *Esau*, which in deed he was not, and consequently we must graunt that either he spake false, & lied (which the ancient Fathers, *S. Am-*

Two examples out of the old Testament. 1.

S. Ambroſe, S. Auguſtine and others doe piouſly deny) or els that he had ſome reſerued further ſenſe in his mind, wherby his ſaid ſpeach might be verified, and conſequently his propoſition be ambiguous, and Equiuocall.

34. But herunto T.M. anſwereth firſt, that *Cardinall Caëtan*, and diuers other learned men doe hold, that *Iacob* is inexcuſable from ſome ſort of lye in this his ſpeach; and for this he alleadgeth the teſtimony of *Pererius* a Ieſuite in his Commentaries vpon Geneſis; who diſputing this matter at large in fiue ſeuerall diſputations, *whether Iacob did ly, or ſinne at all in this ſpeach*, ſaith, that the ſaid *Caïëtan* with ſome other moderne writers doe hold, that it may be graunted that the ſaid Patriarch did commit ſome veniall ſinne, by making an officious ly in that behalfe. But what? doth *Pererius* himſelfe agree to that opinion? No truly? But maketh this title of his laſt diſputation therabout. *The common ſentence of Deuines* (ſaith he) *is declared, and defended, which doth excuſe and free Iacob from all manner of lying in his foreſaid ſpeach*, and then beginning with *S. Auguſtine*, who in diuers partes of his workes doth moſt earneſtly defend the Patriarch *Iacob* in this behalfe, by many and manifold reaſons, and authorities both from all ly and ſinne, doth ſhew and declare that his ſpeach was figuratiue, and not deceiptfull, conteyning *myſterium, non mendacium*, a myſtery, and not a ly. To which effect one place out of his booke againſt lying ſhall ſerue for all: *Non eſt mendacium* (ſaith he) *quando ſilendo abſconditur verum, ſed cùm loquendo promitur falſum: Iacob autem quòd matre fecit auctore, vt patrem fallere videretur, ſi diligenter, & fideliter attendatur, non eſt mendacium, ſed myſterium &c.* It is no ly, when a truth is concealed by ſilence but when a falſity by ſpeach is vttered: that which *Iacob* did by the perſuaſion of his mother, as though he would deceaue his Father, if it be diligently and faithfully conſidered,

Perer. in c. 27. Gen. diſ. 4. & 5.

VVhether Iacob did ly or no in ſaying he vvas Eſau.

Aug. q. 74. in Geneſ. & l. 16 de Ciuit. Dei. c. 37. & l. contra mend. c. 10.

ſidered, was no ly, but a myſtery.

35. And then a little after in the ſame Chapter talking of ſuch miſterious ſpeaches, that ſeeme to ſay one thing, and yet doe meane another, he ſaith thus: *Vera non falſa dicuntur, quoniam vera non falſa ſignificantur, ſeu verbo ſeu facto, quæ ſignificantur enim vtique ipſa dicuntur, putantur autem mendacia, quoniam non ea quæ vera ſignificantur, dicta intelliguntur ſed ea quæ falſa ſunt dicta eſſe creduntur.* In a myſterious ſpeach true thinges, and not falſe are ſpoken, for that true thinges and not falſe are ſignified either by the word, or fact that hath a myſtery in it, for that in deed thoſe thinges are ſpoken which are myſteriouſly ſignified by the ſpeach, but they ſeeme to be lies, for that all men vnderſtād not thoſe things that are truly ſignified by the ſpeach, but rather thoſe thinges that are falſe are thought to be ſpoken. So *S. Auguſtine*. Wherby is euident, what he meaneth by a myſterious ſpeach, to wit, when one ſenſe is gathered by the wordes, & another ſenſe truly ſignified, which the naturall ſignification of the wordes doe not beare, and therby a myſterious propoſition muſt be called alſo Equiuocall in the ſenſe that now wee handle, and conſequently alſo *S. Auguſtine* muſt needes be graunted to admit this kind of Equiuocation without lying, wherby he ſo earneſtly defendeth this Patriarch from all kind of ly whatſoeuer.

That myſterious ſpeeches are Equiuocall.

36. And with *S. Auguſtine* doe concurre in this defence of holy *Iacob* both *S. Hierome*, *S. Chryſoſtome*, *S. Gregory*, *Theodoret*, *S. Ambroſe*, *S. Iſidorus*, *S. Bede*; and of later writers, *Rupertus*, *Gratian*, *Alexander Halenſis*, *Petrus Lombardus*, *S. Thomas* and almoſt infinite others; ſo as for *Th. Morton* to creepe out now vnder the ſhaddow of *Caïetan*, and two or three other moderne Authors more, againſt the whole ſtreme, and torrent of ſo many ancient Fathers, and Catholike Deuines, is a ridiculous euaſion, and worthy of *Thomas Mortons* defence, and full ſatisfaction.

Hier. in c. 2. ad Gal. Chryſ. ho. 53. in Gen. Greg. ho. 6. in Ezec. & lib. 17. Mor. Theod. q. 80. in Ge. Ambr. lib. de Patria. Iacob. Iſid. Beda. & Ruper. in 27. Gen.

Grat.cau. 22.q.2.c. Quæritur. Hal. 2.parte q. 139. Mag. in 3. d.38. D.Tho.2.2 q.110.ar.3

37. His second example out of the old Testament, is that of *Hieremy* the Prophet, set downe by me before in my seauenth Chapter and fourth Consideration therof, which this Minister the better not to be vnderstood relateth only in these few obscure wordes, out of his aduersaries answere: *Such Equiuocation* (saith he) *did the Prophet Ieremy vse. Ier.38. when he tooke aduise of the King.* This relation is briefe, abrupt, and darke as yow see, but we haue declared the matter with the circumstances in the former place, to wit, how *Ieremy* being vrged to make a repetition to the Captaines, & Princes of King *Sedechias*, that were tempted against him, of that conference which had passed in secret betweene him and the said King, of thinges that the King would not haue the said Princes to know, it seemeth by the text of Scripture, that albeit so great and holy a Prophet, sanctified in his mothers wombe, may be presumed not to haue lied; yet that in so large a repetition wherin diuers truthes at the Kinges request were to be concealed, there must in al probality, passe diuers ambiguous, and Equiuocall speaches, for couering those truthes that were not to be vttered, and that so it may be gathered out of *Hieremies* owne narration in the text; and therfore all Equiuocation is not *lying*, nor *heathenish*, or *abhominable prophanation*, as *Thomas Morton* would haue it.

The secõd example.

Num.32.

Conf.p.70

The moderate Answ. cap.10.

38. This is the force of the argument: what answereth he therunto? First, he saith, that our owne ancient expositor *Lyranus* in his Commentary, holdeth that *Ieremy* did not ly, but what of this? So we say also, for that otherwise, we should graunt the Prophet to haue sinned, and Equiuocation to be lying, both which we vtterly deny. Secondly then he leauing quickly this first hold, steepeth to another, more liked by him and his, who would haue all men liars with themselues, and this is, that *Ieremy* did ly in deed, *in that*

T.M. his answere refuted,

his

his relation to the Princes of Sedechias, if we iudge (saith he) *the outward speach of Ieremy, was false; yet is it not written for our imitation &c.* And to this he applieth the words of *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians: Let him that standeth take heed least he fall*, that is to say into lying, as *Ieremy* did: and herwith also he giueth a generall note out of *S. August.* who saith, *that all examples of the old Testament, wherin there may be any scarres of infirmities*, (to vse the wordes of T. M.) *are not to be imitated*, which is true in *S. Augustines* meaning, who alleadgeth the example of *Lot*, in prostitution of his daughters, and of *Dauid* that swore rashly that he would kill *Nabal*, & the like: but it was farre from *S. Augustines* meaning hereby to touch any such holy Prophet, Patriarch, or Saint, as *Ieremy* was, or to condemne them of voluntary lying: therfore here *Thomas Morton* sheweth lesse piety then folly in shifting of thus this place of Scripture.

Pag. 71.

1. Cor. 10.

Aug. l. cõtr. mend. c. 9.

39. And if it were a *scarre of infirmity* in *Hieremy*, to couer sometimes a truth by Equiuocation, or amphibology of some speach for a good and necessary end; yet I hope he will not say so of Christ himselfe, nor lay his *scarres* also vpon him, though yow haue heard now already by many examples, how frequent that manner of speach was with him, vpon sundry occasions, and yow shall heare more presently, for that now we passe to the examples which he citeth, as alleadged by his aduersary out of the new Testament, and we shall see whether he will answere them better then he hath already done these two of the old. And if yow stand attent, yow shall see him confirme our part as clearly, as if he had written for vs, and against himselfe.

T. M. his scarres of infirmity.

Out of the new Teſtament.

The firſt place of the new Teſtamẽt.

40. THe firſt place which he taketh vpon him to ſatisfy out of the new Teſtament as obiected by his Aduerſaries, is that our Sauiours ſaing in *S. Iohns* Ghoſpell: *All thinges whatſoeuer I heard of my Father, haue I made knowne vnto yow*; & yet in the very next enſuing Chapter, Chriſt ſaith, *that he had many thinges to ſay vnto them, but that they were not able to beare them away then*; Wherof is inferred that Chriſtes former ſpeach had ſome mentall reſtriction, or reſeruation in it, as that he had told them all that he had receaued from his Father, that is to ſay, all whatſoeuer he thought conuenient for them to heare at that time, or them fit to beare away, or to make their profit by, or the like, which yet was not expreſſed in wordes in the former propoſition, but reſerued in Chriſtes meaning, & conſequently that propoſition was mixt, and Equiuocall in ſenſe by this mentall reſeruation; what will *Thomas Morton* ſay to this? For if a Ieſuite ſhould come to him, and relate him ſome caſe from another, with this aſſeueration in the end, that he had told him all whatſoeuer he had heard from the other, and yet the next day after ſhould ſay that he had many pointes more to tell him from the ſame party, but it was not time to tell them now, I doubt not but that he would haue cried out, that the Ieſuite had lied the day before, for the euill conceipt he hath of Ieſuites in that behalfe: but if, on the contrary ſide, he had held a good opinion of that Ieſuite his integrity in his point, and that for no worldly reſpect he would make a ly, great or ſmal, (as according to our former doctrine he ſhould not) then muſt *M. Morton* imagine at leaſt, that that Ieſuite did Equiuocate without a ly, and ſo conſequently

Ioan. 15.

Ioan. 16.

A compariſon expreſſing the caſe.

lying

lying & Equiuocation ſhould be two diſtinct things.

41. Well then now I expect what he will anſwere to this ſpeach of Chriſt, whome he will not grant I am ſure to haue Equiuocated, leaſt he ſpeake againſt himſelfe and authorize therby Equiuocation, nor dareth he (I preſume) to ſay, that he lied, leaſt he caſt vpon him *ſo ſoule a ſcarre of infirmirty*: I expect (I ſay) to ſee how he will ſhift of this matter, for that the caſe ſeemeth to be very like, or rather the ſame in both examples, ſetting a ſide the maine difference of the perſons. Yow ſhall heare what full ſatisfaction he wil giue in this behalfe. *I anſwere* (ſaith he) *with S. Auguſtine,* Pag. 72.
now mans infirmity playeth her part, but know yow that no man learneth of Chaſtity to be adulterous, or of godlines to be impiow, and ſhall we learne of truth to be liars, and periurious? God forbid. Aug. l. cõt. mend. c. 19
Thus he out of *S. Auguſtine* as he pretendeth, but in deed ſo brokenly & corruptly alleadged, if yow looke vpon the place it ſelfe, as it may ſcarſely be called *S. Auguſtines* ſpeach. But as for the ſenſe it appertaineth nothing to our purpoſe, for *S. Auguſtine* ſaith, *we my not learne of the truth to be liars,* as the *Priſcillianiſtes* indeauoured to doe by confirming the vnlawfulnes of lying out of the wordes of Chriſt, which we doe not, nor doe we affirme that our Sauiour when he ſaid, *All thinges whatſoeuer I haue heard of my Father I haue made knowne vnto yow,* did ly, or vtter any falſity at all, but reſerued ſomewhat in his mind not vttered, which ioined with his wordes made the propoſition moſt true, and how then is the ſentence of *S. Auguſtine* brought in againſt vs for an anſwere to the difficulty propoſed? By this beginning yow may ſee what full ſatisfaction he is like to giue to theſe places of Scripture. But let vs heare the reſt.

42. Touching this text (ſaith he) your owne Biſhop Pag. 73.
Ianſenius anſwering this obiection ſaith, that theſe kind „
of ſpeaches, and all ſuch are to be expounded accor- „

ding

» ding to the circumstances either of state, place, time or
» condition of the persons speaking, or to whome they
» were spoken, as namely, that whatsoeuer yow aske
» my Father in my name he will giue yow. What any
» thing absolutly? Nay but vpon condition if it be ex-
» pedient for yow. So heere Christ saying I haue mani-
» fested all thinges, it is expounded by the circumstāces
» of the present state, signifying all that appertaineth
» vnto yow to be knowne; so then heere is no conceа-
» led sense to deceaue the hearer &c.

43. Doe yow see what an inference he maketh, that because *Iansenius* doth shew the way how to seeke out the reseruation, or concealed sense in such ambiguous propositions, therfore there is no such mentall reser-
The con-futatiō of his answ. uation, or concealed sense at all? Can the Reader tole-rate such an impertinent writer? Nay doth not all this speach of *Iansenius* make wholy against *Morton*? For if he doe set downe these circumstances of place, time, state, and condition, wherby to seeke out the hidden sense of such dubious propositions, may not we well, and iustly inferre quite contrary to *Mortons* inference, ***Ergo there is some such hidden sense, more then is expressed in the wordes,*** which we call reseruation, wherby the hea-rer may cōceaue a wrōg sense if he hit not vpō the said true reseruation, which being not manifest to euery one, but rather a cōtrary sense appearing in the words vttered, maketh the proposition ambiguous, doubtful
Circum-stances to find out mentall reseruа-tions. and Equiuocall; for that it may haue diuers senses, one in the vnderstanding of the hearer, & another in the meaning of the speaker. And for that the whole im-portance dependeth of the later to wit of the speaker, especially in the speaches vttered by the holy Ghost that cannot be false, the ancient Fathers doe labour by examination of the circumstances, set downe here by *Iansenius*, & other such like, to find out what the spea-kers true meaning was, when the speach of it self is

doubtfull

doubtfull according to the wordes vttered.

44. Nor is the matter ſo eaſy to euery man to find this out by conſideration of circumſtances, as *Thomas Morton* would haue men to thinke, that there is no doubt or difficulty at all: for as in the places before alleadged yow haue heard ſundry Fathers of ſundry opinions, and iudgmentes about the points that were reſerued by our Sauiour: ſo heere in this place vpon thoſe wordes, *Omnia quæcunque &c. all thinges whatſoeuer I haue heard of my Father &c.* diuers Authors as *Leontius*, and others make the reſeruation to be this, whatſoeuer I heard of my Father, *with order to tell yow, that I haue vtterd vnto yow*; but *S. Chryſoſtome, Theophilact, Euthimius*, and other Greeke writers expound it thus, that whatſoeuer I heard of my Father *conuenient for yow to know*, that I haue reuealed vnto yow. *S. Auguſtine*, and *S. Bede* doe thinke Chriſtes meaning to be, that he had reuealed all to his diſciples, *except ſuch thinges as were reſerued for the holy Ghoſt to reueale, and vtter vnto them*, as in the precedent Chapter he promiſed: ſo as albeit here diuers learned Fathers by examining the circumſtances before mencioned, doe gheſſe at diuers mentall reſeruations as yow ſee; yet all doe agree that there were ſome not vttered in the wordes, and not ſo eaſy to be determined, which doth vtterly ouerthrow our Miniſters idle imagination to the contrary, that the matter is euident for euery man to vnderſtand by circumſtance of ſpeech. And yet he concludeth his anſwere in theſe confident wordes, *VVherby* (ſaith he) *yow may perceaue that not that infallible verity, but your owne infirmity and vanity hath deceaued yow in ſo peruerting the truth, to patronize a ly.* Would yow not thinke that the man had ſpoken ſomewhat to the purpoſe, that thus concludeth? Surely not a iote more then yow haue heard, wherin he hath confirmed euidently our part, and ouerthrowne his owne; and yet he braggeth like a

Leont. Chryſoſt. Theoph. Euthim. in hunc locum.

Aug. tract. in c. 15. Io. & Ep. 57. & lib. de Agon. Chriſt. c. 9.

Beda in hunc locũ.

Ioan. 14.

Diuers reſeruations in Chriſt his ſpeech

Pag. 73.

Conquerour, as yow ſee: but let vs leaue him in his vanity, and paſſe to a ſecond place, or example alleadged.

2. About the day of iudgmēt. Marc. 13. Math. 24.

45. The ſecond place is taken out of the Ghoſpell of *S. Marke*, where our Sauiour ſpeaking of the day of Iudgment, ſaid, that *de die autem illo, vel hora nemo ſcit, neque Angeli in cœlo, neque filius, niſi Pater*: Of that day, or houre no man knoweth, neither the Angels in heauen, nor the Sonne, but the Father: which is repeated againe in effect by *S. Matthew*, who hath *Nemo ſcit niſi ſolus Pater*, No man knoweth therof but only the Father: & yet doth the whole courſe of Scripture runne to the contrary, ſhewing that Chriſt muſt be Iudge in that day, as before hath byn ſhewed, and conſequently muſt needes be preſumed to know therof, *S. Paul* ſaith alſo expreſſely to the *Coloſſians, that all the treaſures of wiſedome, and knowledge were hidden in* Chriſt, ergo it is euident that the former propoſition of Chriſt had ſome reſeruation of mind in it, for that otherwiſe it had byn falſe. And for more perſpicuities ſake, let vs frame the caſe more plaine: If thoſe diſciples to whome our Sauiour ſpake thoſe words, had demaunded him, if he knew any thing of the day of Iudgment, and he had anſwered, no, what would that no haue ſignified according to *Thomas Mortons Socraticall* argumētation? Would it not haue directly ſignified (as his words be) that he had not knowne therof in deed? and would not his hearers haue taken it ſo? and yet had it byn falſe, and they deceaued. Why? For that he had ſome further reſeruation in his mind, wheron that (*no*) did reflect, which his wordes did not vtter.

Supra point 2.

Coloſ. 2.

46. Well then compare *Thomas Mortons* caſe which he obiecteth againſt vs and is this: A Catholicke hauing a Prieſt in his houſe, and demaunded whether he know where ſuch a Prieſt is, he anſwereth *no*, reſeruing in his mind a further true meaning, wheron that

no in

no in his intention doth fall, to wit, that he knoweth it not ſo, as it is conuenient to vtter it vnto them that aske him, *Syr Thomas* cryeth out, *that this not a hidden truth but a groſſe ly*. But I would aske him why? And further intreate him, to ſet downe the difference betweene theſe two anſwers of Chriſt, and a Catholike in the manner of ſpeach, and nature of a reſerued propoſition. Pag. 49.

47. If he would ſay that there is no reſeruation in our Sauiours ſpeach, but that the ſenſe is cleare according to the wordes as they ſound, it would be ridiculous, both in regard of the oppoſite authorities before alleadged out of Scriptures; as alſo of the great variety of expoſitions, which the ancient Fathers did leaue vnto vs, for finding out the true reſeruation. And firſt of all condemning for Heretikes, as *S. Damaſcene* teſtifieth, vnder the name of *Themiſtiani*, or *Agnoetæ*, all thoſe that following the litterall apparent ſenſe of thoſe wordes of our Sauiour, did hold him to be ignorant in deed of the day of Iudgment, which being decreed and eſtabliſhed by the Church, ech Father endeauoured to find out the true reſerued meaning, of our Sauiour, as hath byn ſaid; which by experience they proued to be ſo hard, and therwith all to defend the ſame againſt the *Arrians*, who vrged ſtrongly the litterall ſignification of the wordes, againſt Chriſtes Diuinity, as ſome of them held this text to be corrupted, as appeared by the teſtimony both of *S. Hierome* vpon this place, and *S. Ambroſe* in his bookes *de fide*: wherupon euen at this day in *S. Matthewes* Ghoſpell, where Chriſt vſeth the ſame ſpeach, the word *neque filius, neither the Sonne knoweth*, is not read either in Greek or Latin, & yet was it found in diuers Copies of both languages in old time, as may appeare by *Origen*, and *S. Chryſoſtome* in Greeke, and *S. Hilary*, and *S. Auguſtine* in Latin, who did read it in their dayes in their Copies

Dam. l. de Hæreſib. hær. Agnoetæ.

Amb. l. 5. de fide c. 8.

of *S. Mathews* Ghospell, as we doe now in *S. Marke*, and therupon, as hath byn said, indeauoured ech one to find out Christes hidden meaning, and mentall reseruation therin.

48. As for example *Origen* & *S. Epiphanius* doe thinke Christes reseruation to haue byn, that he knew not the day of Iudgment in this life, but in the next; and others, that he knew it not, *quoad experientiam*, by experience, for that he had not yet experienced the same; nor doth *S. Chrysostome* seeme in one place altogeather to mislike this interpretation. Other Fathers in great number doe thinke Christs meaning and reseruation to haue byn, that he knew not of the certaine day of Iudgment, as he was man, that is to say, by vertue of his humanity alone, without his diuinity, for though as he was man and God he knew it; yet not by force or power of his humanity. And of this opinion are *S Athanasius, S. Ambrose, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. Cyril, Theodoret* and others.

Orig. tra. in Mat. 24
Epiph. hæres. 69.
Chrys. ho. de trin.
Atha. ser. 4. contra Aria Am. l. 5. de fide
ca. 8 Naz. Orat. 4. de Theo. Cyr. l. 9. de thesau cap. 4.
Theod. An. cont. Cyr.

49. Many Fathers also, yea the greatest number of all, haue an other exposition expressing the very same reseruatiõ in Christes wordes, which we talked of in our former proposition, affirming that Christes meaning was, whẽ he said he knew not the day of Iudgment, that he knew it not so, as he might discouer it vnto them, or make them know it. And so doth hold *S. Augustine* in many places of his workes, *S. Chrysostome* also in his homilies vpon *S. Mathew* and *S. Marke*, *S. Gregory* in his Register, *S. Hierome* and *S. Bede* in their exposition vpon this place, with whome doe concurre *Theophilact*, and diuers others.

Aug. l. 83. q. 6. & l. 1. de trin. c. 12. & l. de Gen. contr. Manicheos c. 23. Chrys. hom 78. S. Greg. li. 8. Regist. cap. 42.

50. Now then we haue heere, that there are three or foure sortes of reseruations at least, sought out by the foresaid circũstances touched in the former example, al which doe proue vnto vs, that in the proposition of Christ, *the Sonne of man knoweth not of the day or houre*

houre of Iudgment, is an amphibologicall and Equiuocall mixt propoſition, conteyning a mentall reſeruation of our Sauiour, not expreſſed in his wordes, which ouerthroweth and vtterly vndoeth *Th. Mortons* whole Treatiſe: and how doe yow thinke will he play the man heere to auoid all this battery? Yow ſhall heare it preſently, and ſee him brought to miſerable ſtraites: for thus he beginneth to anſwere the matter, hauing confeſſed firſt out of his aduerſaries Treatiſe of Equiuocation, that *Auguſtine*, *Ambroſe*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Baſil* and *Theophilact* doe expound it ſo, as laſtly hath byn ſaid, *that Chriſt knew not the day of Iudgment to vtter it to his diſciples*, wherunto he anſwereth thus.

Th. Morton brought to great ſtraites.

51. *It will not* (ſaith he) *be pertinent to oppoſe the other expoſition of Fathers, who as your* Maldonate *ſaith, were many, expounding this text thus, that Chriſt as he was man knew not the day and houre.* This is his firſt ſtruggle, and if it be impertinent, as himſelfe confeſſeth, why doth he alleadge it, but for lacke of better defence, and that it is impertinent in deed, is euident; for that this expoſition of ſome Fathers alleadged by him, doth rather proue that there were diuers reſeruations in Chriſtes wordes, then that there was none at all, which he ſhould proue. Wherfore it falleth out to *Thomas Morton* in this caſe, as when playing a bad game at Tables that is paſt recouery, he ſhould ſay, this game is loſt which way ſoeuer I play it, and yet will I play it out with what ſhame ſoeuer, rather then giue it vp. Let vs ſee then what play he maketh.

52. He followeth on immediatly after his former ſpeach thus: *But the queſtion is* (ſaith he) whether the former expoſition of *S. Auguſtine* and others doth imply any mentall Equiuocation, and becauſe *Garnet* at his arraignment did ſelect only *S. Auguſtine* of all the Fathers, we will appeale to *S. Auguſtine* for anſwere to them all, by whoſe teſtimony it doth appeare, that "

S. Auguſtines authority alleadged by F. Garnet examined.

» when our Sauiour ſaid, *I know not the day*, ſignifying *vt*
» *dicam vobis*, to tell vnto yow, this clauſe wherby he
» meant to conceale the time, was not concealed from
» thē, who though they were by the ſenſe of the ſpeach
» held in ignorance not to know the day; yet were they
» not ignorant of the ſenſe of the ſpeach, which was,
» *I may not let yow know it*. So he. And doe yow vnder-
ſtand him? or doth he not labour aſmuch to hold yow in ignorance of his meaning, as Chriſt did his Diſciples of the day of iudgment; but let vs draw him out of this affected darkenes.

53. Firſt he ſaith the queſtion is, (and he ſaith well) whether the former expoſition of *S. Auguſtine*, & other Fathers doe imply any mentall Equiuocation or rather mentall reſeruation, which maketh Equiuocation or doubtfulnes of meaning; and I ſee not how he can deny it, for that the propoſition, *Chriſt knoweth not of the day of Iudgment* is falſe, without ſome reſeruation, but with the reſeruation gathered vpon *S. Auguſtines* expoſition, to wit, that he knew it not to make them know it, that is to ſay, to vtter it vnto them, it is true, ergo *S. Auguſtines* expoſition doth imply and declare vnto vs a manifeſt mentall reſeruation, and cōſequently álſo an Equiuocation. For that as before we haue defined the matter, Equiuocation or amphibology in this our controuerſy, is nothing els, but when a ſpeach is partly vttered in wordes, and partly reſerued in mind, by which reſeruation the ſenſe of the propoſition may be diuers.

The definition of Equiuocation as heere it is vnderſtood.

54. Secondly wheras *Thomas Morton* ſaith, that *Father Garnet* at his arraignment did ſelect only *S. Auguſtine*, of all other Fathers to depend vpon, concerning the former expoſition of Chriſtes wordes, and therfore that he alſo will appeale to *S. Auguſtine* for anſwere to them all, it is a ſhift, therby to auoid the authority of all the other Fathers, both in this and the other expoſitions

before

before mentioned, all which doe conclude againſt him, as hath byn ſaid, that there is a mentall reſeruation in Chriſtes wordes, without which vnderſtood, the propoſition is falſe. Neither did *Father Garnet* ſo ſelect *S. Auguſtines* authority at his arraignmēt to ſtand vpon, as that he left any way the other Fathers, but being preſſed to be briefe, he named him for all, and no ſmall maruaile it is that at ſuch an arraignment he had leyſure, or liſt to name any Father, or other proofe at all, knowing how vnequally the ſame would be heard after the hydeous clamours of ſo many Miniſters out of bookes, ſpeeches, & pulpittes againſt that doctrine: but ſure I am, that if *Henry Garnet*, and *Thomas Morton* had met togeather at any equall barre out of arraignment, to plead and diſpute this matter, there would haue byn as little cauſe for *Thomas* to haue triumphed of that diſputation, as there is like to be now of this his writing; and therfore he might haue ſpared him heere if he had pleaſed.

F. Garnets alleadging S. Auguſt. at his arraignmēt.

55. But his third act of manhood in his defence is moſt notorious, where hauing fled all other Fathers, as yow ſee, to ſticke to *S. Auguſtine*, he bringeth in *S. Auguſtine* wholy againſt himſelfe, as now yow ſhall ſee, though he endeauour by ſome obſcure words to dazle the ſenſe of his hearer. For in the words of *Saint Auguſtine* by him alleadged he ſaith thus: *Neſcientem ſe eſſe dixit, quia illos neſcientes occultando faciebat.* Chriſt ſaid he was ignorant of the day of Iudgement, for that he made them ignorant therof, by hyding the ſame from them. And in another place: *Hoc neſcit filius quod neſcientes facit, hoc eſt, quod non ita ſciebat, vt tunc diſcipulis indicaret:* the Sonne of God is ſaid not to know that, which he maketh other men not to know, that is to ſay, that he knoweth it not ſo, as he would vtter it at that time to his Diſciples. And for proofe of this expoſition *S. Auguſtine* alleadgeth that place of *S. Paul* to the *Corinthians:*

Aug. vbi ſupra.

1. Cor. 2. *thians: neque enim iudicaui me ſcire aliquid inter vos, niſi Ieſum Chriſtum, & hunc Crucifixum*: Neither did I eſteeme my ſelfe to know any thing among yow, but only Ieſus Chriſt, and him crucified, where *S. Paul* ſaith he knew no more of that thing, for that he thought it not time to vtter vnto them any more: which is ſo plaine for our purpoſe, as *Thomas Morton* would neuer haue alleadged it, but vpon plaine deſpaire of the game loſt in deed. For what is more conforme then this to our anſwere obiected by him, *I am no Prieſt, to vtter it vnto yow: I know not where ſuch a Prieſt is*, that is, I make yow not to know it by concealing the ſame, for that I am not bound, nor is it expedient to vtter it.

S. Auguſt. authority wholy againſt T. M. that alleageth the ſame.

56. Now then heere yow ſee *Thomas Morton* in the duſt, as one fighting againſt himſelfe. For to cauill, & quarrell, as he doth afterward, that the Apoſtles are to be preſumed to haue vnderſtood this reſerued meaning, aſwell as *S. Auguſtine*, *S. Ambroſe*, and other Fathers did, and that if they did, then it was no Equiuocation: and further that it were blaſphemy to ſay that Chriſt did Equiuocate with his Apoſtles; all theſe ſhiftes (I ſay) are but ridiculous. For firſt it importeth not to our queſtion, whether the Apoſtles vnderſtood the ſecret meaning of Chriſt in this deniall, or not, but rather whether there were any reſeruation, & whether the ſpeach of it ſelfe were ambiguous, and Equiuocall to the hearers (who were many beſides the Apoſtles) by reaſon of this reſeruation, and all Chriſtians haue byn and ſhall be to the worldes end. And then if this ſo, it is no blaſphemy to ſay, that Chriſt did Equiuocate, that is to ſay, ſpeake doubtfully, but rather it is blaſphemy by excluding all Equiuocation, to condemne the ſame for lying, as *Morton* is forced to doe, or to ſay nothing.

Shiftes confuted.

57. And laſtly where he concludeth the whole matter by the teſtimony of our Doctor *Geneſius* as he calleth

Of Doctor Geneſius Sepulueda

leth him, I haue told before how he is ours, and how in ſome ſort he may in this controuerſy be called his, though he deteſted his Religion, as by his workes appeareth. Ours he is, as in all other points of Religion, ſo in the ſubſtantiall and principall point of this queſtion, for that he defendeth the vſe of Equiuocation in concealing ſome ſecrettes, but denieth it in others, wherin he fauoureth ſomewhat the aduerſe party, with ſmall ground, as in the next Chapter ſhall be declared. But what ſaith this Doctor *Geneſius? He will tell yow* (ſaith *Morton*) *that this ſenſe* (of this text of Scripture) *which yow conceale, is not only contrary to the ſentence of all Fathers, but alſo againſt all common ſenſe.* And is this poſſible? Will *Sepulueda* deny all thoſe Fathers alleadged by me before for our interpretation to be Fathers? will he ſay that their expoſition is contrary to all common ſenſe? Doth not *Geneſius* himſelfe in the very Chapter heere cited alleadge both *S. Hierome* and *S. Auguſtine* for this interpretation, and alloweth the ſame? What ſhameles dealing then is this of our Miniſter to charge *Geneſius* with ſuch folly or impiety which he neuer thought of? For *Geneſius* denieth not either the ſenſe, or interpretation of the place, and much leſſe ſaith, *that it is contrary to the ſentence of the Fathers*, and leaſt of all *to common ſenſe*, but denieth only the application therof for vſe and practice to certaine caſes, wherin he admitteth not Equiuocation, and ſaith, that vpon this interpretatiõ, to bring in ſuch a new law were greatly inconuenient (wherin afterward notwithſtanding we ſhall ſhew him to haue byn greatly deceaued) and his Latin wordes are: *Contra non modò veterum & grauiſſimorum doctorum, ſed communem hominem ſenſum, quaſi legem inducere:* to bringe in, as it were, a law not only againſt the iudgment of ancient, and moſt graue Schoole-Doctors (for of them only he ſpeaketh in that place) but alſo againſt the commõ ſenſe or opinion of men. This

Geneſ. Sepulu. l. de rat. dicend. teſtim. c. 3.

is *Geneſius* his ſpeach, wherin though his iudgment be reiected by other Schoolmen as ſinguler and paradoxicall in this point, as after ſhall be declared; yet is he egregiouſly abuſed by *Morton*, who firſt maketh him to ſay of the interpretation, and ſenſe of this place of Scripture, that which he ſpeaketh only of the application therof, to vſe and practice in tribunalles. And ſecondly he maketh him to diſcredit the Fathers which himſelfe alleadgeth: thē he Engliſheth ancient Fathers for ancient Schoole-Doctors: and laſt of all addeth *conſenſum* of his owne, leauing out *hominum*, to make it ſound common ſenſe, and other ſuch abuſes, which any man may ſee by conferring the place. And theſe are other manner of ſinnes, then ſimple Equiuocation, if the art of falſifying or forgery be any ſinne with him at all, and ſo much for this place of Scripture.

Geneſius much abuſed by T.M.

58. The third place alleadged, and pretended to be anſwered by this man, is that of *S. Lukes* Ghoſpell, when our Sauiour drawing towardes the Caſtell of *Emaus*, with his two diſciples, *Ipſe ſe finxit longius ire*, ſaith the text; himſelf feigned that he would goe further: wherupon they forced him to ſtay with them, and heerof is inferred, that Chriſt vſed at that time ſome doubtfull action or wordes, importing a different externall ſignification to his diſciples, from his inward meaning, which may truly be called ambiguity, amphibology, or Equiuocation in fact, for that Equiuocation, as hath byn ſaid, may be vſed either in factes or ſpeach, and conſequently that our Sauiour did heere Equiuocate with his diſciples making them belieue a different thing from that he meant, for he meant to goe no further, but to ſtay there with them, as is gathered out of the text it ſelfe, for that otherwiſe the Euangeliſt would not haue ſaid, *and he feigned to goe further*; nor may it without impiety be called a

3. Hovv Chriſt did feigne or diſſemble.

Luc. vlt. ver. 28.

ly, of

ly, of what ſort ſoeuer, as *S. Auguſtine* expreſly doth proue in diuers partes of his workes: how then will *Thomas Morton* deliuer himſelfe from this labyrinth? He hath no probable eſcape at all, as yow ſhall ſee in the ſequent point about feigning or deceauing, for that this place doth more properly appertaine to that matter and ſubiect, this being no reſerued propoſition, but rather a diſsimulation, or fiction in act, as is preſumed, as that our Sauiour went further then the place, or made ſhew that he would doe ſo, or the like, and conſequently we ſhall differre the larger declaration of this place vnto the enſuing point or paragraphe, which is the fourth and laſt of this Chapter.

59. The fourth and laſt place then, which our Miniſter hath alleadged out of the foreſaid Catholicke Treatiſe of Equiuocation, with pretence to anſwere the ſame, is the ſpeach of our Sauiour to his brethren or kinſmen in *S. Iohns* Ghoſpell, who exhorting him to goe vp to *Ieruſalem* to celebrate the feaſt of Tabernacles, and therby to be knowne to the world, he anſwered with ſhewing firſt a great difference betweene his ſtate and theirs, and how the world hated him, but not them, and why, and then ſaid, *goe yow vp to this feſtiuall day, I doe not goe vp to this feaſt, for that my time is not yet accomplished*; but yet after they being gone vp, he aſcended alſo. Out of which ſpeach and fact is gathered, that Chriſt when he ſaid to his brethren, *I doe not aſcend*, or *will not aſcend* to this feaſt, he had ſome further mentall reſeruation, which his brethren vnderſtood not, for that otherwiſe they would not haue gone vp without him, ſo as heere is a plaine Equiuocall propoſition, that hath one meaning according to the wordes in the hearers vnderſtanding, and another in the ſenſe of the ſpeaker, wherby the hearers were deceaued: and yet was this no ly. What then will *Thomas Morton* ſay to this? Yow ſhall ſee him beſtirre

4. About our Sauiours deniall to aſcend to the feſtiuall day.

Ioan. 7.

himſelfe for ſome euaſion, but with as good ſucceſſe as the good-wife that was early vp, & neuer the neare, which example I vſe to temperate ſomewhat his intemperate Miniſteriall ſpeach of louing and imbracing queanes in the very beginning of his anſwere: for thus he writeth:

Pag. 78. 60. Yow haue (ſaith he) beſtowed many lines in » commenting vpon this text, to euince from hence » your reſerued conceipt: let me borrow a little leaue to » plead as well for truth, as yow doe for a ly, and ſhew VVanton and vndecēt ſpeech of T.M. yow, how expounding this place, yow blinded with the loue of your *Thais*, had rather ſnatch at any meaning, then take that which is meant: for thoſe words, » *I will not goe vp*, in the Greeke are, *I will not goe vp yet*: But » your *Helena* the Latin vulgar text muſt be imbraced &c. Doe yow ſee what manner of accuſation he bringeth in againſt vs, and in what light & laſciuious wordes, in ſo graue and ſacred a ſubiect as is the text of holy writ? Hath he no honeſter compariſons to bring in then the blind loue of *Thais*, and embracing of *Helena*? yow may iudge of the mans ſpirit by his wordes.

61. But what doth he accuſe vs of in effect? forſooth that we haue left the Greeke text, which hath *'óupoo nondum, not yet*, & doe follow the vulgar Latin, which hath only *'ou*, that is *non*, not, the difference of which word maketh a maine diuerſity in the matter if yow marke it well, for if the true text be *nondum, I will not yet goe vp*, then is there no doubt or difficulty at all of the ſenſe, for that Chriſt had ſaid plainly that he would not goe vp then, and ſo his going vp afterward had byn no contradiction any way to his former ſpeach of not going vp, as heere our *Maldonate* cited by *Morton* doth cōfeſſe: but on the other ſide if the matter were ſo plaine by reading *nondum* in the Greeke, why doe the ancient Fathers labour ſo much to find out the

Ioan. 7.

ſecret

ſecret meaning, and reſerued ſenſe of our Sauiour in this ſentence and ſeeming contradiction of his? For *S. Auguſtine* and *S. Bede* after much ſearch, doe thinke his meaning to haue byn, *that he would not aſcend to that feaſt with a humane ſpirit, to procure worldly honour, name or fame, as his brethren exhorted him by making himſelfe knowne, and admired to the world by working of miracles &c. Strabus* & other expoſitours doe interpret, that he would not aſcend to ſuffer, or exhibite his paſsion in *Ieruſalem* at this feaſt of tabernacles, but reſerue it for the paſch, or feaſt of *Eaſter*, according to the appointment of his Father, and to this effect ſaid, *tempus meum nondum aduenit*, my time is not yet come. *Eucherius* in his queſtions vpon this Ghoſpell, thinketh that our Sauiour meant that he would not aſcend vp to the firſt day of the feaſt, (which was properly called the feſtiuall day,) but ſome day after, for it laſted ſeauen dayes, as appeareth *Exod.* 25. *Leuit.* 23. *Deut.* 16. And this expoſition is approued in like manner both by *S. Cyril*, *S. Auguſtine* and *Ammonius* and others in reſpect of thoſe wordes of the Euangeliſt verſ. 14. *Iam autem die feſto mediante aſcendit Ieſus in templum*; Chriſt aſcended to the Temple the feaſt being halfe ended: albeit this being ſpoken of his going vp to the Temple, other thinke that he went vp to the citty after his brethren, before the firſt day, but not into the Temple to celebrate the feaſt.

Diuers expoſitions of the Fathers about Chriſtes mentall reſeruation.

1.

2.

3.

62. Wherfore ſeing theſe and other Fathers doe labour ſo much to find out the meaning of Chriſt in this ſentẽce, it is not like, that the matter was ſo cleare as T. M. would make it, by the clauſe *nondum*: for if that word had byn in all Greeke bookes, and ſo held for the true text, there had byn no queſtion, or controuerſy as expoſitours confeſſe: yet we grant with *Maldonate* alleadged by *Th. Morton*, that very many Greeke copies had it ſo in former times, & haue it at this day; neither doth our vulgar tranſlation deny or diſſemble

A cleere argument.

the same, for albeit it haue *non*, & not *nondum*; yet doth it expresly signify in the margent, that diuers manuscriptes haue *nondum*, and so doth set it downe for *varia lectio*, yea the *Rhemes* English Testament it self doth expresse that translation also in the margent, *I will not goe vp yet:* so as *Mortons* scoffe of our *Thais* and *Helena* is a meere calumniation as yow see, and worthy of a man of his profession.

63. Nor doe we reiect the Greeke text any where, when with more probability of truth it may be admitted, as heere in this place they are our expositours & not his, that haue taught him to talke of *'oupoo, nondum* to wit, *Iansenius*, *Tolet* and *Maldonate*. And the two former for more facility of explication doe follow the same, and the sense therof in their commentaries: we also in our vulgar Latin translation, which *Morton* calleth our *Helena*, doe goe neerer many times to the Greeke then Protestants, as heere our said Latin text saith, *Ego non ascendo* in the present tense according to the Greeke, I doe not ascend, wheras *Thomas Morton* translateth, *I will not ascend* in the future, which the Greeke hath not. And againe diuers Greeke textes haue not at all these wordes, *I doe not ascend to this feast*, according to *Maldonate* and *Tolet*, and diuers other Greeke textes haue the word *nyn* (*nunc*) added, that is, I will not ascend now, both which notwithstanding are reiected by the Protestants themselues: all which being so, yow may consider of the wise speach of T. M. in this place: *VVe will not* (saith he) *so strictly chalenge our right in this equity approued by all antiquity, which is, that as in discerning pure water, rather to examine it by the fountaine then the riuer, so we iudge of the truth of textes by the Originall, rather then the translation.*

The Catholicks fly not the Greek text where it may more probably be followed.

Pag. 79.

A vaine vaunt of T. M.

64. And doe yow so Sir? And doe we contradict this? Your very next immediate wordes doe cleare vs from this your calumniation, for it followeth in your speach:

ſpeach: *Your Latin text (ſay yow) doth ſufficiently betoken the ſame ſenſe of the Greeke,* (not yet) *and ſo doe two of the principall Doctors of your Church, Tolet, and Ianſenius paraphraſe.* And is it ſo? how then are we ſo blinded with the loue of our *Thais*, as rather to ſnatch at any meaning, then take that which is meant? how ſay yow that our *Helena*, the Latin tranſlation, is imbraced by vs before the Greeke, if our Latin doe not only betoken the ſame ſenſe of the Greeke, as heere yow confeſſe, but ſetteth it downe ſo as *varia lectio* in the margent, as before hath byn ſhewed; yea and that two of our principall Doctors doe follow the ſame in their paraphraſes? Is not this to accuſe and defend, affirme and deny, and to ſpeake contraries with one and the ſame breath?

'óuk 'anabaínoo nya

65. But to drawe to an end, and conclude the principall point of this controuerſy, yow ſee how *Thomas Morton* ſeeketh to auoid the force of this place, where Chriſt denied that he would goe vp to the feſtiuall day, and yet afterward went vp, by this only euaſion, that very many Greeke copies haue the word *nondum*: and for this he alleadgeth the teſtimony of our *Maldonate* in his Commentary vpon that place. But what? did *Maldonate* ſay, that all Greeke copies had it ſo? or that the moſt ancient, and pureſt did ſo read? or that he himſelfe was of that opinion? No truly: but the quite contrary, for he proueth by diuers ſtrong argumentes, that this word *'óupoo, nondum* was not in the old copy in *S. Hieromes* time, and before, when our vulgar Latin tranſlation was ſet forth. Firſt, for that it is like that the ſaid Latin tranſlation would aſwell *haue expreſſed it, as betoken it*, to vſe *Mortons* owne phraſe, and put it in the margent, eſpecially for ſo much as the ſenſe, and difficulty of Chriſtes meaning, ſhould haue byn made more eaſy therby. Secondly for that diuers Greeke Fathers as *Cyril, Euthymius*, and others doe not read

Diuers argumentes to proue that 'oupoo *nondum* vvas not in the more ancient and truer Greeke copies.

1.

2.

read *'oupoo* but *'ou, non* and not *nondum*, which is a token that thoſe Greeke textes of the Ghoſpell, which they vſed in their dayes had it as our Latin hath now.

3. Thirdly for that *Beda, Strabus, Rupertus* and all other Latin Authors whatſoeuer, not any one excepted in *Maldonats* iudgment doe read *non* and not *nondum*, who notwithſtanding did conferre with the Greeke Copies of their time, and eſpecially *S. Hierome* moſt learned in all languages, who is held for the principall Author of this our Latin vulgar tranſlation.

4. 66. Fourthly all the Ancient Fathers before named both Greeke and Latin, that laboured to find out the true meaning of Chriſt in this his doubtfull ſpeach, did not know this euaſion in their dayes by the word *nondum*, for that it had byn folly to take ſo much paines to diſcouer a meaning or reſeruation that was cleare of it ſelf.

Tvvo ſtrōg argumēts.

5. Fifthly we doe read in *S. Hierome* that *Porphyrius* the Apoſtata in his moſt ſpitefull inuectiues againſt our Sauiour, did obiect this as a principall place to diſcredit him withal, that he ſaying he would not goe vp to that feaſt, did notwithſtanding goe vp afterward, which he being a moſt learned Grecian, and vſing all the Greeke textes of that time, for his purpoſe, as hauing byn a Chriſtian before, it may be preſumed, that if any of them had then read *'oupoo*, wherby his obiection had byn anſwered, he would neuer haue vpbrayded the ſame, eſpecially againſt ſuch learned Chriſtian Doctors of the Greek Church that liued with him, and wrote againſt him, as *Origen, Ammonius, Dionyſius Alexandrinus* and others, all within three hundred yeares after Chriſt, who no doubt would haue anſwered *Porphyrius* as *Thomas Morton* doth now anſwere vs, with *'oupoo*, if there had byn any ſuch thing in the Greeke text in their dayes.

Hiero. l. 2. eōtra Pel.

The impiety of Porphyr.

6. 67. And finally if Chriſt our Sauiour had anſwered his brethren, I will not yet goe vp, they would haue asked

asked him againe, when he would go, & would haue ſtayed for him, and of likelyhood would not haue departed without him; All which reaſons, and conſiderations *Thomas Morton* paſſeth ouer and diſſembleth, & is full glad that he hath a hole to ſlipp out any way. And yet to ſhew one point of manhood in this his flight, he taketh vpon him to anſwere one of theſe ſix arguments alleadged againſt him, which is the fourth cõcerning the ancient Fathers that laboured to ſeeke out Chriſts reſerued meaning, and you ſhall ſee how full ſatisfaction he giueth according to the tytle of his booke: *VVhat ſhall we then ſay* (ſaith he) *to the other expoſitions* (of Fathers) *obiected? Only this; that whatſoeuer expoſition they vnderſtand, they did thinke that the ſame was as well vnderſtood of the Apoſtles as of themſelues.* Heere be two pointes inſinuated, if you conſider them attentyuely, the firſt, that the ancient Fathers did ſuppoſe, that whatſoeuer Chriſts meaning was in theſe wordes to his brethren (whom *Mortõ* calleth heere the Apoſtles) they did (the ſaid kinſmen of our Sauiour) vnderſtand the ſame aſwell then, to wit before the ghoſpell was written, and before the holy ghoſt was giuen, as the ſaid Chriſtian Fathers and learned Doctors did afterward by the learning, and light they had from the ſpirit and tradition of the Church: which propoſition if he were put to proue in the preſence of learned men, I doubt not but that he would quickly be in a poore and pittifull plight.

T. M. his manhood in his flight.

Pag. 80.

1.

68. The ſecond thing which by this his anſwere he would haue vs vnderſtand is, that if theſe brethren or kinſmen of Chriſt, did any way conceaue our Sauiours meaning, then was there no reſeruation at all, for that as he ſaith, *our ioyned reſeruation is alwayes ſuppoſed to be a clauſe concealed, and not vnderſtood.* But this is a greater foolery then the firſt, for that there may be a reſeruation in the ſpeakers mynd, though vnderſtood to

2.

Pag. 80.

ſome of the heares. As for example in our propoſition being demaunded, whether I be a prieſt, and I ſay no, reſeruing to my ſelfe, as often before hath byn declared, that I am no ſuch, or ſuch prieſt, as I ought to vtter the ſame to you, though ſome of the examiners ſhould gheſſe at my reſeruation, or know the ſame certaynly, for that otherwiſe they know I am a prieſt, this doth not make that this propoſition in it ſelfe, & in my meaning is not a reſerued or equiuocall propoſition, for that they vnderſtand it. And yet as though the poore man had played his prize well, he concludeth triumphantly in theſe wordes: *Therfore in all theſe expoſitions alleadged, there appeareth not the leaſt haire of your fox tayle of Equiuocation: Scriptures forſake you, or rather you them, now will you haue recourſe vnto Fathers?*

A reſerued propoſition may be vnderſtood by the hearers and yet be equiuocal.

69. But whether Scriptures haue forſaken him, or vs in this conflict, or whether the Fathers expoſitions haue ſtood with his, or our cauſe, the reader I ſuppoſe hath ſufficiently ſeene: nor is it needfull for vs, to make any further recourſe vnto Fathers, hauing ſhewed them to ſtand fully for vs in allowing reſerued mixt propoſitions, which of neceſsity do make ambiguity, and equiuocation euen in Chriſtes owne ſpeaches, as hath bene declared: Which if *Mortons* vncircumciſed mouth will call alſo *fox-tayles* we may well be contented to beare ſuch a Miniſteriall ſcoffe in ſo good a cauſe and company. And finally what this man eſteemeth of holy Fathers when they make againſt him, is eaſely ſeene by that he ſaith in the next Chapter after, where hauing cyted out of the former Catholicke Treatiſe, the ſaying of *S. Gregorie* the Great, that we ought not to reſpect ſo much the wordes of any ſpeech, as the will & intent of the ſpeaker, *Quia non debet intentio verbis deſeruire, ſed verba intentioni*; for that the intẽtion of the ſpeaker ought not to ſerue to his wordes, but his wordes to his intention; after a

Greg li. 26. moral. c. 7. The abuſe of S. Gregory by T. M.

ſcoffe

ſoffe or two againſt the ſaid Father, *that if an Author muſt be ſought for a lye, it was moſt likely he ſhould be a Pope*, he maketh this cõcluſion: *I dare boldly conclude* (ſaith he) *that though S. Gregorie, or a thouſand of Saincts; yea though celeſtiall Gabriel, or any Angell from heauen ſhould teach, and authorize ſuch a Doctrine as this, we may from the word of God pronounce him Anathema.* So he. Pag. 82.

70. And he concludeth boldly in deed, but who more bold then blynd *Bayard* (as the prouerbe ſaith) he may as well pronounce *Anathema* and curſe, not only vpon Saincts and Angels, but vpon the Sonne of God himſelfe, as by this time his diſcreete Reader hath ſeene and conſidered. And can there be any more blind boldnes then this? Is he not aſhamed of this ſo ſhamefull ouerſight? doth he not remember what he ſaid before, *not one iota in all Scripture, not one example in all antiquity, not one ſhaddow of reaſon in all the wit of man can be brought for any colour of Equiuocation*? I wil not pretermitt his very laſt wordes immediatly following, wherwith he concludeth his twelueth Chapter, for that they conteyne a full vpſhot of his folly. *Now* (ſaith he) *that we haue wreſted your weapons out of your handes* (by anſwering Scriptures and Fathers as before he hath anſwered) *it wilbe eaſie to pearce you euen with ſimilitudes, the blunteſt kind of arguments that are*: And then he followeth on in the next Chapter to pearce vs with ſignes, coynes, Giges ringes, and other like toyes: but we, as you haue ſeene haue pearced him in the meane pace with ſubſtantiall arguments of truth her ſelfe, out of both Scriptures and Fathers, and ſhall do yet more in the enſuing paragraph, leauing him now to his ſimilitudes, ſignes, coynes, Giges ringes, and other ſuch like iugling wordes, and inſtruments fitt for a man of his diſpoſition. Pag. 48. Pag. 82.

THE FOVRTH AND LAST POINT OF THIS CHAPTER

About Scriptures, and Fathers *That defended* Equiuocation *from the name and nature of* Deceipt *and* fallacy: VVITH *Some other proofes out of common Reason &c.* §. 4.

71. I May be very breif in this, for that I haue handled the same argument in the later end of the
Nu. 59. former Chapter, and in this I haue byn longer then
64. 55. I had purposed, & therfore I will only adioyne in this place some few examples more, for iustifying of that which there we touched in few wordes. For wheras according to *S. Augustines* defynition before set downe, two thinges are to be required to a ly, first to vtter that with is false and disagreeing from the vnderstanding of the speaker; the other that there be intention to deceaue; the first, of falsitie, hath byn largly proued not to be found in our reserued proposition, *I am no priest*, for that the speaker hath a true meaning in his sense: Now must we handle the second about deceit, of which we haue said before, that neither this clause of the definition of lying is found in the said

pro-

propoſition, for that the Anſwerers firſt & principall intent is not to deceaue the demaunder to his hurt, but to deliuer himſelfe by concealing a truth only, which truth he is not bound to vtter, & this in effect is to permit the other to be deceaued, and not properly to deceaue, or to haue intention or cupidity of deceauing, as *S. Auguſtines* wordes are.

72. And for that I promiſed in the former paragraph to handle more largly in this place, the diſsimulation or fiction of our Sauiour related in the end of *S. Lukes* Ghoſpell, when he went with his two diſciples to the Caſtle of *Emaus*, which by the Euangeliſt it ſet downe in theſe words: *Ieſus autem finxit ſe longiùs ire*, Ieſus did feigne that he would goe further, or as the Greek hath it, *Proſepoiêito*, he did make ſhew or pretend as though he would go further; I ſhall heere relate ſomewhat largely the wordes of a learned Biſhop of our time, vpon that place to wit *Ianſenius* oftentymes cyted by *Thomas Morton* himſelf.

About the fictiõ of our Sauiour at the Caſtle of Emaus. *Luc.* 24. *v.* 28. Proſepoiêito porrootéroo poréueſthai-

73. *Eſt mendacium* (ſaith he) *ſecundum Auguſtini finitionem &c.* Aly according to *S. Auguſtines* definition, is a falſe ſignification, with a will to deceaue; wherfore as it is no lye or fallacy at all, when a man ſpeaketh that which in his owne ſenſe is true, though it be falſe in the ſenſe which the hearer conceiueth, ſo that the ſpeaker doe not vtter thoſe ambiguous words with intention to deceaue another, but only to conceale profitably ſome truth; euen ſo fiction and ſimulation which is in facts, is not vnlawfull, but profitable and wholſome, wherwith a man doth ſomething by which he knoweth that another man will conceiue a falſe opinion of that he ſaith, ſo that he doth not this with intention to ingender this falſe opinion in him, but for ſome other profitable end. As for example *S. Paul* in a certaine manner, did feigne himſelf to be an obſeruer of the Iewiſh Law, when he did circumciſe

Ianſenius comment. in cõcord. Euang. c. 146.

The diſcourſe of B. Ianſen. about Chriſtes fiction.

Act. 16. cumcise *Tymothy*, and did beare himself as a Iew with
» the Iewes, and vnder the Law with them that were
» vnder the Law, and he did know that by keeping the
» ceremonies of the Law, the Iewes would think him
» to liue vnder the law; but yet he deceaued them not,
» for that he did not obserue those ceremonies of the
» Law, to the end to deceaue them, but rather that by
» concealing his owne opinion for a time, he might
» gaine them, or at leastwise not alienate them from
» Christ: and so now Christ our Sauiour did feigne
» himself to goe further, composing his gestures & mo-
» tions of body, as though he would go beyond that
» Castle; by doing wherof he knew, that his disciples
» would think, that he had a purpose to go further; but
» yet he did not compose his gestures and motions, to
» make them thinke so, but his end was by this meanes
» to stirre vp in them their loue towards him, and the
» vertue of hospitality, wherby they might be made
» apt, and worthie to haue their eyes opened to know
him.

74. This is the discourse of this learned Bishop, for defending our Sauiours deed frō reprehensible fictiō and dissimulation; to wit, that his first and principall intention was not (as neither that of *S. Paul*) to deceaue his hearers, albeit that did follow consequently vpon their facts, that is to say, that the other were deceaued. And the very same falleth out in our case, yea with one principall circumstance more of iustification, then is expressed in the former exāples, which is, that in our case (as before hath byn shewed) violence and iniury is offred by the demander, meaning to punish the partie examined vniustly, or to draw secrets from him, which he is not boūd to vtter, but rather is bound sometymes not to vtter to his owne & other mens preiudice, hurt, and dammage: by which circumstance of iniuryes offred, we haue recorded before

Application of our case vvith this of our Sauiour.

before that stratagems in warrs are made lawfull, by *S. Augustine*, and all other Deuynes iudgment. And to alledge more Fathers sentences in proofe of this were wholy needles, forsomuch as the practice therof throughout all Christendome for all ages, amongest what Religions or Sects soeuer, is admitted and put in vre without any doubt or contradiction. *Supra.c.7.*

75. It remayneth then most certain among deuynes, and most euident by Scripture it self, that the clause of *S. Augustine* in the definition of lying, *animus fallendi*, intention to deceaue, doth not include permission, when one permitteth another to be deceaued; nor yet the clause set downe by diuers Authors in the definition of deceipt, which is to ingender a false opinion in the hearers mynd, different from that of the speaker, includeth the said permission, when I suffer another man to gather a false conceipt or opinion vpon any fact or speech of mine that is true, and lawfull in my sense. For if we should condemne this, we should condemne God himself of iniustice and iniquitie, which were blasphemy.

Permitting an other to be deceaued is not to deceaue. *Tolet. li. de sept. peccat. c. 46. Maldonat. coment. in cap. 24. Luc. v. 28.*

76. And for proof of this doe our deuynes cite many places, and examples out of holy writ, besides those already alledged, wherby is shewed, that Almighty God, of whome otherwise all Catholicks hold, as an article of faith, that he is not able by any power of his to deceaue any man: yet that in this kynde of permissiue deceipt he may do it, and hath don it, and doth it dayly, according to that of the Psalme talking of wicked men and their prosperitie in this life, by which they are deceaued and ouerthrowne, not knowing to vse them well, the Prophet saith to almighty God; *Veruntamen propter dolos posuisti eis*; Thou hast giuen them (these riches) for snares to intãngle them, that is to say, thou hast permitted them to be intangled, and snared in them to their damnation, by taking away

D. Thom. 2. 2. q. 1. ar. 3. Bannes Valẽtia & alij in eumdẽ locum.

Psalm. 72.

away thy light of grace from them.

77. Yea oftentimes God goeth ſo farre in this permiſsion, and the Scripture vttereth the ſame in ſuch effectuall wordes, as it may ſeeme at the firſt ſight, that God doth not only permit men to be blynded, and miſtake, & be deceaued; but rather that he doth it actiuely & poſitiuely himſelf, to which effect ſound thoſe wordes of the Goſpell: *Tenebantur oculi eorum, ne eum agnoſcerent*; There eyes were held to the end they ſhould not know him. And that of *Iob* ſpeaking of Almighty God, *Qui immutat cor Principum populi terræ, & decipit eos, vt fruſtrà incedant, & errare eos facit quaſi ebrios:* he doth chang the harts of Princes of the earth, and deceaueth them to make them walk in vaine & doth cauſe them to erre, as if they were drunke. Who would not thinke that this were more then only permiſsion? We read alſo in the third Booke of Kinges, that God appearing vnto *Micheas* the Prophet, ſitting vpon his ſtate of Maieſty, with an army of heauen about him, ſaid, who ſhall deceaue King *Achab*, to make him go vp and make warr in *Ramoth-Galad*, and be ouerthrowne there; and when diuers had ſpoken diuerſly, a lying ſpirit ſtept forth and ſaid that he would deceaue him, and God anſwered, *egredere & fac ita*, go forth and do ſo; whervpon *Micheas* inferreth preſently *dedit Dominus ſpiritum mendacij in ore omnium Prophetarum*, God gaue a lying ſpirit in the mouth of all the falſe Prophets, which ſeemeth may inferre, that God did actually cooperate to that deceipt, and not only permit the ſame, and ſo haue diuers heretickes taken it: but the Catholick Church hath neuer vnderſtood the ſame further, then as a permiſsion, as that ſpeech of our Sauiour to *Iudas*, *quod facis fac citiùs*, that which thou art to doe, doe it quickly, which was no commandment, but a permiſsion, and ſo the other *fac ita*, to the lying ſpirit.

Luce vltimo.

Iob. 12.

Cap. 22.

How God cõcurreth to deceit by permiſsion.

Ioan. 13.

78. And

78. And the very ſame is to be vnderſtood in many other places of Scripture, as that of *Iſay*; *Quare errare fecisti nos Domine de viis tuis?* why haſt thou made vs: (o Lord) to erre from thy wayes? And that of *Ezechiel*, where God ſaith of himſelf: *Propheta cùm errauerit, ego Dominus decepi Prophetam illum*; when any Prophet doth erre, I the lord, haue deceaued that prophet. And *S. Paul* to the *Romans*, ſpeaking of the old heathen Philoſophers; *Tradidit illos Deus in reprobum ſenſum, vt faciant ea quæ non conuenium*: God hath deliuered them ouer into a reprobate ſenſe, that they may doe theſe thinges that are not conuenient. All which places, according to the interpretations of holy * Fathers, and Doctors of the Catholicke Church (which were ouer long to recite in this place) are to be vnderſtood that God doth permit men to be deceaued, and to be deliuered ouer into a reprobate ſenſe for their ſinnes, and ſo, as a great Deuine of our time doth obſerue, it is not only a ſimple permiſsion of Almighty-God, but conioyned alſo with his diuine ordination that ordayneth out of his iuſtice ſuch a permiſsion for puniſhment of their ſinnes, that are ſo blynded or deceaued, which he proueth out of the wordes and reaſon of the laſt recited ſentence of *S. Paul*, concerning the old Philoſophers, ſaying, *propter quod tradidit illos Deus in reprobum ſenſum*, for which God deliuered them ouer into a reprobate ſenſe: what meaneth this cauſatiue, *for which*, ſaith this deuine? *S. Paul* himſelf doth expound it, when he ſaith a little before, *Quia cùm cognouiſſent Deum, non ſicut Deum glorificauerunt*, for that wheras they knew him to be God, they did not glorifie him as God: this then (ſaith he) is more then a ſimple permiſsion in reſpect of their demerit, that God is ſaid to haue blynded them, which is not ſaid in the fall of the Angell, nor of *Adam* that God did blynde them, though he ſuffred them to fal. So this learned Doctor.

Iſay 63.

Ezechiel. 14.

Rom. 1.

* *See S. Hier. epiſt. ad Helio. quæſt. 10. S. Gregor. li. 13. moral. cap. 16. Damaſcen. li. 4. Theolog. cap. 14. D. Tho. li. 3. contra gentes c. 162. & lib. 12. quæſt. 79. Dominicus Bannes. in 2. 2. q. 1. ar. 3. dub 2. ad 7.*

Gods ordination ioyned oftētimes vvith his permiſſiō.

79. Out of which obseruation is made euident, that the more fault the party deceaued is in, the more iustly he is permitted to be blynded, & deceaued, and if it be lawfull for a good end to suffer any to erre or be deceaued, so we vtter no ly or falshood of our part, but rather speake a truth in our owne meaning (as out of the former Doctrine of *Iansenius*, which is the common Doctrine of all Catholickes, and out of diuers sayinges of Christ himself, and his Apostles hath byn declared:) how much more is it lawful for a mans owne necessary defense to vse the same; when iniustice, violence, or iniury is offred as before hath byn declared?

80. And truly this matter is so cleer euen by the instinct of nature it self, that God hath left some refuge in reason for a man to declyne lawfully such an assault, when it falleth vpon him, as to deny this, is to deny common sense and feeling of all men. For who is there of any meane wit or capacitie, that being asked of a secret which he would not vtter, and pressed so as he must either incurre great inconuenience by vttering, or make a lye by denying (which lye euery good mynd by nature hateth, as both *Aristotle* and *S. Augustine* doe confesse:) who is there (I say) that naturally doth not seeke out some euasion, by answering doubtfully, but yet endeauoring to retaine some true sense in his owne meaning? Do not all sortes of men euen by the instinct of nature it self vse and practice this, without any instruction at all? they being commonly the best mynds and most tymerous cõsciences, that doe seek to vse these euasions by amphibologies, & equiuocall speeches, wheras the other of worser myndes, make no scruple to lye at all?

Arist. li. 4 Ethicor. cap. 7. August. li. cont. mendac. cap. 15. & in Enchirid. c. 22.

Equiuocation by reason & instinct of nature.

81. And I would in this point aske my Aduersary *Thomas Morton* this case, that if a great man in England whose fauour he much desireth and esteemeth, and

yet

yet would be loth to lend him money for that he knew him to ſpend much, and not to hold payment of his debtes to be neceſſary to ſaluation, if: this great man (I ſay) demanded him whether he had fyue hundred poundes to lend him, & ſuppoſing that he had them, but loth to lend or looſe them, what would he do or anſwer in this caſe, if there be no other meanes, but either to confeſſe that he hath them, and therby looſe them by lending, or denie that he hath them, & therby incurre a lye and looſe his ſoule? Is there no meane between theſe two extreames? Hath God and nature left no lawfull manner of euaſion, by force of wit and reaſon whereby a man may deliuer himſelf from ſuch an incumbrance? If not, it may ſeeme that God hath prouided worſe for mans defence in this caſe, then he hath done for many vnreaſonable creatures, to whom he hath giuen ſuch ſharpnes of ſenſe in this behalf for their lawfull defence, as the ſtratagems are very ſtrange which *Pliny*, *Solinus*, *Cicero*, and many other Authors doe recount of them, as the *Hare* and *Fox*, by leaps, turninges, and wyndinges, and going backe again in the ſame trace they come, therby to deceiue the doggs: the *Hearnshaw* and other foules for deluding the faulcon; and other creatures in like occaſions of defence.

A peculier caſe propoſed to Thomas Morton.

Stratagems of vnreaſonable creatures. *Plini. li. 9. cap. 42. Solin. cap. 38. Cicero li. 1. de natura Deorum.*

82. And for ſomuch as the vſe of reaſon and wit is the cheif armour and weapon of mankynde, there can be no doubt, but that a man may euen by Law of nature it ſelf, extend the ſame to all wayes of defence: that may be, without offence of Gods law, and therfore ſeeing that we haue ſhewed before, that doubfull or amphibologicall ſpeech that hath a true meaning in the ſpeakers vnderſtanding and is vſed by him not to deceaue or hurt, but to defend himſelf, is no ly, or falſhood at all, and conſequently is lawfull; it cannot be reprehenſible in iuſt occaſions to vſe the ſame.

VVherein equiuocations may not be vſed.

And I ſay *in iuſt occaſions*, according to the explications therof before ſet downe, which afterwards in like manner, ſhall more particularly be declared; for that without iuſt cauſe, as in confeſsion of our faith, common conuerſation, mutuall traffique, and the like where preiudice therby may grow to any man, or to the common credit of dealing there may they not be vſed, as often hath byn ſaid.

83. Now then to retourne to our example of *Thomas Morton* and his fyue hundred pounds, I do not doubt but that he would anſwere the Noble man, that he had them not, though they lay in his cheſt, vnderſtanding by force of equiuocation (though neuer ſomuch deteſted by his ſoule as he ſaith) that he had them not to lend him, or not in his purſe, or not ſo, as he could ſpare them, or ſome other like reſeruation, which we ſay that without a lye he might vſe. And I doubt not but that either with a lye or without a ly he would practice it, if I be not deceaued in my opinion of his wiſdome, and conſcience in that behalf.

An other caſe propoſed.

84. The like caſe might be propoſed of his wyfe (if he haue any) or of any other married woman who being demaunded by her iealous husband, whether ſhe had byn falſe vnto him or no, if ſhe ſay yea, and confeſſe the truth, there goeth her honour and temporall life therin; but if ſhe ſay no, & make a lye, there goeth the ſpirituall death of her ſoule: what would yow *M. Morton* counſell her to doe in this caſe, if yow were her Ghoſtly Father? to ly you may not aduiſe her, according to *S. Auguſtine* before recited; no not for the ſauing of her owne life, or of any other: to deſtroy or diſgrace herſelf by her owne cõfeſsion, when the cryme is ſecret, nor any witnes or other proofes extant, were hard to counſell her, and againſt equity: if then without making a ly ſhe might eſcape and deliuer her ſelf by vſing ſome equiuocation of words, will

will you call it *heathenish, hellish,* & *a monstrous hydra*? But I do hope by this time that yow are somwhat calmed in your former heates against this doctrine, and therfore I will vrge no further your outragious tearmes against the same, but nowe shall passe to set downe the particuler cases, wherin our Doctors do hold that some equiuocation or amphibologie of words may be lawfully vsed without ly or other offence.

OF CERTAINE PARTICVLER CASES, AND OCCASIONS,

VVherin it may be lawfull to vſe the manner of Equiuocation, *or* Amphybology *before ſet downe, either in ſpeach or oath:*

VVith the reaſons therof.

CHAP. X.

HYtherto haue we treated of Amphibologie, and Equiuocation in generall, to wit, what their nature is, how different from lying, & conſequently that in ſome cauſes, and occurrent occaſions they may be lawfull, and vſed by good men without ſinne, or offence, and ſo haue byn by inſt & holy perſons, yea often by the holy Ghoſt himſelfe, as before largely hath byn declared. Now then for more perſpicuitie it remayneth that we lay forth breifely ſome particuler, and principall caſes, wherin the ſaid vſe of Am-

Amphibologie or Equiuocation by learned Catholick Deuynes is admitted and allowed; which we shall do with the greateſt breuitie, and perſpicuity that we may, conſidering the great variety of Authors, matters, and opinions, that vpon ſuch Caſes doe ariſe: the ſeueral explication wherof would require a great volume. But it ſhall be ſufficient for the iudicious Reader to vnderſtand, that as in all other humaine, and morall matters, there may be and is commonly difference of opinions, how this or that ought to be done or practiſed, though they agree in the Doctrine: ſo heere alſo when and how, and in what wordes, and what forme of ſpeach a man may iuſtlie vſe Amphibologie or Equiuocation, for couering of Secrets that are not conuenient to be vttered, all doe not agree, but haue their different iudgements, though in the principall they doe all concurre that in ſome caſes the ſaid Amphibologie or equiuocation may be lawfully vſed without lying, or other ſinne: of which Caſes we ſhall heere recite ſome principall.

The firſt caſe about the ſecret of Confeſſion. §. I.

2. THE firſt and moſt generall caſe, wherin * all Schole Doctors without exception do agree that ſuch Equiuocation may be vſed, is in matters appertayning to the ſeale of *Sacramentall Confeſſion*, to wit, if a Cõfeſſour or Prieſt that hath heard an other mans confeſsion, ſhould be demaunded whether ſuch a one had confeſſed ſuch a ſyn vnto him or not, though no wayes, nor vpon any conſideration whatſoeuer he may

1.

* *D Thom. in 4. d. 21. q. 3. & 2. 2. q. 70. art. 1 ad 2. Caiet. ibi. in fine. Mich. Salõ*

ib.concl.5. Arag.ib.in Solut. ad arg.2. S.T. Palu.4.d. 21.q.3.ar.1 cõcl.1. & ar.3.cõcl.1 Scot.ibi.2. §.de ista qu.cõcl.1. & 2.Ant. p.2.ti.1.c. 19.§.7.in fi.Sot.li.5 de iust.q.7 ar.1.ad 1. & in rel. de tegen. secreto. m.1.q.2. Syl.verb. Testis. q.8.versu Secundũ. Nau.in m. c.18.n.51. & 52. & in caput interverb. 11.q.3.cõc. 6.coroll. 64.num. 707. & alij omn. * lib.5.c. 66.

may tell a lie, according to our former Doctrine; yet may he not only say, *nescio*, I know nothing, but answere directly, that he hath not confessed any such thing vnto him, albeit he had so done; and that the said Confessour may not say, but sweare also this answere of his, vnderstanding & reseruing in his mynd, that the penitent hath not cõfessed the same vnto him so as he may vtter it. The reason of which answer, albeit diuers Authors do diuersly explicate, as that this was confessed to him, not as to man, but vnto God, or as to Gods substitute in the tribunall of Cõfession, and the like: wherin I remit the Reader to *Dominicus Sotus*, a learned Deuine, and to Doctor *Nauar* no lesse renowned lawyer, who handle the matter at large in seueral Treatises; yet both they, and all other Deuines and lawyers, as hath byn said, do hold that in this case of Confession, the obligation of secrecy is so great, as for no respect whatsoeuer, nor to what person soeuer, though he be neuer so lawful a Iudge, Prince, Prelate or Superiour, nor for sauing of a whole Kingdome or common wealth, and much lesse the liues of any particuler men, or women, or of the confessour himselfe, no nor of the whole world togeather if it were possible, or to worke neuer so much good therby, nor though the said Cõfessour were put in neuer so great torments, *imò si mille mortes ferendæ essent*, if a thousand deathes (saith * *Tolet*) were to be suffered by him, yet might he not vtter the same. And further if the Case should fall out that he could not confesse his owne sinnes, without giuing some particuler, and personall suspicion of the other vnto his confessour, he were bound vnder sinne to pretermit his owne confession, vntill he found another Confessour, vnto whome without this perill he might be confessed.

3. Which sacred and inuiolable seale of this Sacramentall secrecy being considered, and that Amphibologicall

bologicall and Equiuocall ſpeach with a true reſeruation of mynd is no lye at all, as in the precedent Chapters hath byn largely proued, it is inferred that a Confeſſour in this cale, is not only allowed to vſe the ſame prudently, when need is, for couering of the ſaid ſecrecy, but is bound alſo in conſcience thervnto, vnder greiuous ſinne, when by no other meanes of ſilence, diuerſiō, or euaſion the ſaid ſecrecy can be concealed.

4. And in this al Schole-Deuines whatſoeuer do agree, as hath byn ſaid, and namely all thoſe whome before we haue mentioned in the precedent Chapter, and firſt point therof; and among other *M. Mortons Geneſius* in like manner is with vs, & againſt him, whom he hath picked out as ſingular and ſingle among all Catholicke writers in this behalfe, denying the lawfulnes of Equiuocation in ſundry other Caſes, but in this granting and auouching the ſame with great aſſeueration in theſe wordes: *Deus & Eccleſia, ipſaq; ratio naturalis arcanum ſacræ confeſſionis, quod multis ſcriptis legibus nominatim eſt ſancitum, tam ſanctum eſſe voluerunt, vt in nulla (prudenti modò, & coacta) ſic cognitorum peccatorum inficiatione poßit eſſe vel periurium, vel mendacium, propter Sacramenti huius maieſtatem, & maximam publicamque Religionis Chriſtianæ perturbationem.* God and the Church, and naturall reaſon it ſelfe, would haue this ſecret of holy Confeſsion to be ſo inuiolable, which is eſtabliſhed alſo by many written lawes (*of the Church*) as by no denyall of ſinnes ſo knowne in confeſsion (ſo it be prudently done, and vpon compulſion) can there be either periury, or lying, both in regard of the Maieſty of this Sacrament of Confeſsion, and of the great and publicke perturbation of Chriſtian Religion, which would otherwiſe enſue if matters reuealed in confeſſion, might at any time, vpon any occaſion, be vttered againe. So he. Holding as you ſee, that no denyall

Genes. Sepulueda de rat. dicendi tegſtim in cauſis occultorum criminum cap. 3.

Geneſius againſt T. M.

of matters heard or knowne by confession, in what sort soeuer, can be a lye, or periurie: the reason therof being not only that which heere *Sepulueda* doth touch; but also for that which before hath byn insynuated, that thinges knowne in Almighty Gods Court and trybunall, and as vttered vnto himself, may truly be denyed to be knowne in a humaine tribunall, and as the priest is a priuate man, and not a publicke minister of God.

5. One only Case there is, wherin all the said Deuines agree that a Confessor may vtter any Cryme confessed vnto him. *Vnus est solus casus* (saith Tolet) *in quo Confessarius potest alteri manifestare peccatum Confessionis. &c.* One only caie there is, in which the Confessor may manifest a syn heard in Confession vnto an other, to wit, by licence and Commission of the penitent himself, which thing Doctor *Nauarre* doth proue at large by the common opinion of *S. Thomas*, & other Schoole Deuines, with the concurrence, and consent of the Canon law, and lawyes cyted by him And then must he reueale it also, but to him alone for whom he hath licence, *& qui alio casu reuelat, grauissimè peccat mortaliter* (saith *Tolet*:) and whosoeuer in any other case doth reueale it he doth sinne a most grieuous mortall sinne, and incurreth also the punishment assigned by the church in the Canon law, for so heynous a cryme: *And if further* (saith he) *any wicked Iudge should compell him to reueale the same vnder an oath, he may sweare, that he knoweth no such sinne, though he know it indeed, but yet knoweth it not so as he may reueale it.* And this is the common Doctryne of all, disputed more at large by the Reuerend and learned man *Dominicus Sotus* the Emperour *Charles* his Confessor, in a speciall Treatise called, **Relectio de tegendo secreto*: A Relection about couering secrets; wherin he sheweth how farre a man may disclose them, and what obligation he hath of conscience to con-

Tolet. lib. 3. de instruct. Sacerdot. cap. 16.
Nauar. comment. in cap. human: ante res 22. q. 5. & de pœnitent. dist. 6. cap. Sacerdos. nu. 151.
Tolet ibid. l. 3. cap. 16.
**Capitulo omnis vtriusque sexus de pœnitent. & remiss. sione.*

conceale them, in euery ſorte or kind. And thus much breifly for this firſt caſe.

The ſecond caſe about Secretes of the Common welth. §. 2.

6. THE ſecond Caſe that for obligation of ſecrecy commeth next to this firſt, though in a different degree, is, when Magiſtrates, and ſuch as haue gouernement in the Common wealth, as *Senatours, Councellours, Gouernours, Secretaries, Notaries*, and the like, and conſequently do know the ſecrets therof, are preſſed to vtter them, which they may not do in matters of moment, and that may turne to the preiudice of the ſaid Cõmon wealth, or of any particuler man, if the buſineſſe be of great weight, and handled ſecretly by the Cõmon wealth, for any cauſe or peril whatſoeuer; yea though their liues ſhould go therin, for that they are more bound by reaſon of their offices to the reſeruation of publicke ſecrets, both by law of nature, humane & diuine, then priuate men are: though as *Dominicus Sotus* in his foreſaid booke. *De tegendo Secreto* doth ſhew, that a priuate man alſo comming to know any ſecrets of the Common wealth, is bound vnder mortall ſinne to conceale them, and rather to ſuffer death then to diſcloſe the ſame, eſpecially to enemyes, as the Ciuil law alſo declareth; but much more thoſe that are in publicke office, wherof *Sotus* giueth this example among other. If a Iudge which heareth a weighty cauſe, ſhould be aſſayled by one party, *vt merita cauſæ prodat*, to vtter the merites or ſecrets of the cauſe, *debet potius gladio ſuccumbere, quam fidem*

2.

Sotus relect. de tegendo ſecreto memb. 2. 9. 4 Conclus. 6. L. omne delictum ff. de re militari.

ſecreti frangere: He ought rather to ſuffer himſelfe to be ſlayne by the ſword, then to breake his faith by vttering that ſecret: but much greater, & more greiuous ſinne it ſhould be to vtter the ſame for money or bribery, hatred, malice, or other like cauſe. *Et idem crediderim* (ſaith he) *de Scribis, quorum fidei cauſæ graues committuntur*: and the ſame I would thinke of *Notaryes, Scribes*, or *Secretaries*, to whoſe faith weightie matters are committed.

7. And finally the ſaid Author hauing handled in the firſt part of his ſaid learned booke, the great obligation that man hath by law, both of faith, iuſtice, equitie, and charitie to conceale ſecrets, he putteth theſe degrees therof: *In primo gradu* (ſaith he) *eſt ſecretum Confeſſionis; in ſecundo ſecretum publicum &c.* In the firſt degree is the ſecret of Confeſsion, wherof we haue handled before; in the ſecond degree, is the ſecret of the Common wealth out of Confeſsion; in the third degree, is the ſecret of priuate perſons, and that in different ſort, all which we are bound to conceale ordinarily, vnder the payne of mortall ſinne, except the ſmalnes of the cauſe do ſometymes excuſe the ſame, and make it veniall. So this learned man; and it is the common opinion of other Schoole-Deuines in like manner.

Sot. rel. lect. mem. 1. q. 1. & 2.

Sot. ibid. memb. 1. q. 2. concluſ. 4.

Hovv a man may vſe equiuocation or amphibology for defence of publick ſecrets.

8. Wherfore ſeing the obligation not only of concealing ſecrets heard in Confeſsion, but of thoſe alſo that be ſecular out of Confeſsion, is ſo great, eſpecially of thoſe that be publicke and appertayne to the common wealth; it followeth that when a man ſhall be vniuſtly preſſed to vtter the ſame, he may not only deny to vtter them, which he muſt do vpon payne of damnation as yow haue heard; but alſo diſſemble to know them by any way of lawfull ſpeach, that may haue a true ſenſe in his meaning, though in his that preſſeth to know them, it be otherwiſe: wherof beſides

ſides that which in the precedent Chapters hath byn ſaid, we ſhall haue occaſion to treate more in the next caſe enſuing, which is more generall. For if it be lawfull for any priuate man that is called in queſtion touching matters concerning himſelfe, and is wrongfully vrged to vtter his ſecrets, to make euaſion by any kind of lawfull amphibologie, or Equiuocation, as preſently ſhall be proued, then much more in defence of the publicke ſecret, that concerneth the good of the Common wealth, may the ſaid Magiſtrate, or publicke officers when they are iniuſtly demaunded, or vrged contrary to the forme of law, vſe the benefit of like euaſion ſo they ſpeake no lye (which alwayes is preſuppoſed to be forbidden as vnlawfull for what cauſe ſoeuer :) and ſo much the more, for that being publicke perſons, and as ſuch, knowing the ſaid ſecrets of the common wealth, they may as priuate perſons deny *to know the ſame*, with this or like true reſeruation of mynd, *ſo as they are bound, or may vtter the ſame vnto him, that vnlawfully demaundeth. &c.*

9. And for that this caſe as hath byn ſaid, is for the moſt parte included, & handled againe in that which enſueth, we ſhall heere treate the ſame no further, nor cite more Authors about the determination therof, for that thoſe arguments and authorities that determine the one, do decyde alſo the other.

The third case about any Party accused or called in Question. §. 3.

10. THE third Case considerable in this place, is *de Reo*, of the partie accused, or called in question in iudgement, what or how he is bound to answere vnto crymes laid against him, or to interrogatoryes proposed. About which point, first all the foresaid * Schoole-Deuines, lawyers, and others do agree with one consent, that euery such partie is bound vnder paine of mortall sinne, to answere directly, truly, and plainly, according to the mind, and intention of the demaunder, and not to his owne, and to confesse the truth without art, euasion, Equiuocation, or other shift or declination, when soeuer the demaunder is his lawfull Iudge in that matter, and proceedeth lawfully, that is to say, according to forme of lawe, and equitie therin. And if the said accused, or defendant either by wilfull holding his peace, or by denying the truth, or by deluding the Iudge do refuge to do this, he sinneth greuously therin. Neither may his ghostly Father absolue him in confession from this, or any other sinnes, vntill he yeeld to performe his dutie in this behalfe, though it should be to the euident perill, and losse of his life by confessing the Cryme. And this do the foresaid Authors *S. Thomas*, and others proue cleerly, first out of the Scriptures, as where it is said Eccles. 4. *Pro anima tua ne confundaris dicere verum*, be not ashamed to speake the truth though thy life lye theron, (which is to be vnderstood, when a lawfull Iudge or Superiour doth lawfully demaund it:) and

* See D. Tho. 2. 2 q. 69 in corp. Caiet. i. id. ad 2. ration. Sot. de tegen secr. memb 2 q. 2. & latius eone. 7. q. 2. & 2 & 5. lib. de iust. q. 6 art. 2. conc. 1. Cordu. lib. 1 q. q. 43 du 3 Nau c. 25. Sum lat n. 51. citat que Scip in d ca. interverb. n. 725. Et reuera ita tenet & n. 814. & nu. 822. Couar. in pract. q. 23. n. 5 Gabr. in 4 d 15 q. 6 a. 2 cō. 6 R sel. v. accusatus. paragr. 1. Palud. in 4. d. 19. q. 4. n. 7. Henriq. quodl. 1 q. 33. ex Iuristis. Grego. Lopez (super part. 7. tit. 29. l. 4. Arbid. pag.

Iosue also Cap. 7. when by Gods direction he examined *Achan* the sonne of *Charmi*, about the thinges he had stollen, vsed this phrase, *Da gloriam Deo, & confitere*, giue the glory to God, & confesse the truth, wherby is inferred that he taketh Gods glory from him, and sinneth grieuously that refuseth to confesse the truth to a lawfull Magistrate, proceeding lawfully against him, for that the Magistrate is in the place of Almighty God, and he that resisteth him in his lawfull office, *resisteth Gods power and ordination*, & incurreth damnation therby, as *S. Paul Rom.* 13. auoucheth. And for so much as the inquiring out, and punishing of malefactors is one of the chiefe, and principall partes of the Magistrates office, for conseruation of the Common wealth, both temporall and spirituall, to resiste, deceaue, delude, or contemne the Iudge, or Magistrates authority in this so principall a point therof, must needs be a great and grieuous mortall sinne, except as some Doctors do note, the smalnes or lightnes of the matter obiected should be such as might mitigate the greiuousnes of the same. And this is the seuerity of Catholicke Doctrine for answering directly, obediently, and truly to lawfull Iudges proceeding lawfully.

Itē quod dicitur apud Bart. in l. Marcellus. ff. de actionib. rerū amotarū Spec. tit. de pœnitentib. parag. 7. v. 19. Roder. Suar. l. 4. tit. 12. de las iuras. lib. 2 Fr. de legum. Ant. Gom. to. 3. var. resol. c. 12 n. 15 Bernar. Diaz. in pract. crim. c. 118. Medin. in sum. lib. 2 c. 14. tit. 35

11. But now when the Iudge is not lawfull, or not cōpetent at least in that cause, or proceedeth not lawfully; then all these foresaid obligations do cease in the defendant. As for example, if in *France*, *Spayne*, or *Italy*, a great man that is no Iudge, nor hath authority from the Prince, Prelate, or common wealth, should take vpon him to examine any party of crymes without commission, or other power, or being a lay Iudge should examine priests of Ecclesiasticall matters, who both by diuine and humane law according to Catholicke Doctrine are exempted from lay mens iurisdiction, (as largely hath byn proued of late in an Answere

Cap.2.nu. 37. & 38. *Extra. de accusationibus cap. æqualiter & cap. inquisitionis.*

swere against *Sir Edward Cookes fifth Part of Reportes*, which I would with the Reader to pervse:) or if his iurisdiction were sufficient in that matter, yet if that he proceeded not *iuridicè*, lawfully, or according to forme of law in that cause, *indiciis, vel infamiâ, vel semiplenâ saltem probatione non precedentibus*, that is to say, that neither signes, or tokens, or common fame, or some one substantiall witnesse at least be extant against him, (which circumstances of lawfull proceeding are handled by lawyers in that case:) when this (I say) or any of this falleth out, then hold the former Doctors that all the forsaid obligations of true answering vnto him do no more bynde, for that he is no more a Iudge in that cause, but rather an enemy, for that he proceedeth contrarie to iustice, and forme of law, by which he should iudge; and consequently that in this case the defendant may either deny to answere, or appeale from him, if it may auaile him, or except against the forme of proceeding, or deny all that is proposed in the forme, as it is proposed, or vse any other lawfull declination saith *S. Thomas*, but yet so, as he do not lye, or vtter any falsitie. *Potest vel per appellationem* (saith he) *vel aliter licitè subterfugere; mendacium tamen dicere non licet.* He may either by appellation, or otherwise lawfully seeke some euasion; but yet so as he vtter no lye.

VVhen a man is not boūd to answere

D.Th.2.2. q.69.ar.1.

12. And hitherto now in this point all the former Authors do agree without discrepancy, that the defendant being thus vninstly pressed, may vse all lawfull meanes to auoyd the iniury offered him: and *Dominicus Sotus* that is the most scrupulous in this matter, saith: *Possunt & debent sic contra ius requisiti, quacunque vti amphibologia, quam vsitatus sermo citra mendacium ferre possit:* they that are so required to answere against lawe, may and ought to vse whatsoeuer amphibologie, or equiuocation the vsuall speach of men doth, or may beare, without a lye.

Sot. lib.5. de Iur. iustit. q.6. ar.2.

13. And

13. And thus farre also doth concurre *Genesius Sepulueda*, whome *Thomas Morton* hath chosen out for some helpe in this matter; who though in some particuler pointes, he dissent from the rest, as presently shall be shewed; yet in this he agreeth. For thus he writeth: *Valae Theologi ac Iurisperiti consentiunt, neque reum in sua, nec testem in aliena causa de occulto crimine rogatum, teneri vt veritatem confiteatur, aut testificetur, ne si dederit quidem iusiurandum se vera responsurum:* Both Deuines and lawyers do generally agree in this point, that neither the defendant in his owne cause, nor a witnes in another mans, being examined of a secret cryme, is bound to confesse or testifye the truth, no, though they haue taken an oath first to vtter the truth. So he of the Generall cõsent of all Deuines, and lawyers, adding his owne opinion more particuler in the same Chapter, and telling vs first, when the Iudge demaundeth vniustly, to wit, when he demaundeth of secrets, or matters not belonging to his iurisdiction, as before hath byn said. In which Case he writeth thus: *Itaque vrgente Iudice iniuste vt neget, aut confiteatur, sine culpa vlla potest superiorem Iudicem appellare, & cum alia quacunque ratione, modò sit honesta difugere, nulla adhibita fraude, nullo dolo qui vim obtineat mendacij.* When a Iudge doth vniustly vrge the defendant to deny, or confesse, he may without any fault either appeale to a Superiour Iudge (if it be permitted) or by any other honest meanes declyne the force and violence that is offred vnto him, so it be done without any such fraud, or guyle, as may include the nature of a lye: so as in this all do agree, first, that for no cause a lye may be admitted, or committed; & secondly that any manner of euasion either by amphibologie, or equiuocation may be vsed, which is not a lye. And this in generall.

Genes. Dialog. de rat. dicendi testim. cap. 17.

How far Sepulueda cõcurreth with the rest.

14. But now in particuler what manner, or forme of wordes may be vsed by the defendant for auoyding

the iniury offred him, and deluding the vniuſt Iudge, is not ſo generally agreed of among all men. For this ſame *Sepulueda* holdeth that, *omnis inficiatio veri*, as his wordes are, that is to ſay, all manner of denyall of the thing that is true, except of matters in confeſsion, hath the force of a ly, or falſhood, and conſequently cannot be admitted. But this is commonly refuted by all, and that with great reaſon, as afterward ſhalbe ſhewed, for that otherwiſe in the examples before alleadged, neither *S. Iohn* could truly haue denyed himſelf to be a Prophet, nor *Chriſt* himſelfe to be our *Iudge* in the ſenſe they did; for that they were truly both Prophet and Iudge in their meaning, and yet did they truly deny them both. *Dominicus Sotus* alſo, though he go further, and do confeſſe that the defendant in ſuch a Caſe being iniuſtly preſſed by the Iudge, may lawfully anſwere, *neſcio*, I know nothing therof; yet dareth he not, as he ſaith to allow that he may ſay abſolutly *non feci*, I haue not done it, as the prieſt may ſay of matters confeſſed vnto him *non audiui*, I haue not heard any ſuch thing, for that in his iudgemẽt, as alſo in that of *Sepulueda* there is a great difference in the caſes, which though in ſome reſpectes it be graunted alſo by others; yet in this point which is the only & principall, whether it be a lye or no, all the reſt doe hold that this negatiue anſwere of the defendant is no leſſe free frõ the nature of a lye, then the other of the prieſt, the one and the other being freed therfrom by the due, and iuſt reſeruation in the ſpeakers mynd, wherby the ſenſe is made true, not only in the meaning or vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker, but in the ſight of Almighty God the higheſt, and ſupreme Iudge of all, vnto whom it is lawfull to appeale in harte and word, when any man is vniuſtly oppreſſed by humane iniquity.

Sepulueda

Dominicus Sotus.

The common opinion for Equiuocation.

15. To begin then with the Authors of this cõmon opinion,

opinion, that the defendant may say, *I haue not done it*, vnderstanding, *so as by right and law I am bound to vtter it vnto yow*; first of all the famous Doctor *Nauar* that was schoolfellow with *Sepulueda* and liued togeather with *Sotus*, discusseth the matter at large in diuers partes of his workes; but especially in a particuler large Commentary vpon a Canon of the law, taken out of *S. Gregories* wordes that beginneth, *Humanæ aures*, where he proueth that the said defendant being so pressed vniustly to answere, when he hath no other way lefte to defend himselfe, may truly, and without any lye at all, say, *he did it not*, with the foresaid reseruation of mynd, *that he did it not in some such sense*, as in his owne meaning, and in the eares of Almighty God, is true; though the vniust Iudge taking it in another sense, be deceaued therby, which falleth out iustly vnto him, for that he proceedeth iniustly against law. And the said Doctor proueth this his assertion by many arguments taken both out of Scriptures, Canon law, and reason it selfe, marualling at the scrupulosity of *Sotus* in this behalfe, and alleadging against him that of the psalme: *Trepidauit timore vbi non erat timor*, he trembled with feare, where there was no feare, to wit, of sinne or lying in this case. And moreouer refuteth his fellow-scholler *Sepulueda*, by telling him, that he was greatly deceaued in saying, that no Schoole-Deuine vntil *Gabriel* had held this opiniõ; wheras saith he both *S. Hierome*, *S. Gregory*, and *S. Thomas* haue in effect expressed the same; but more clearly *Scotus*, *Richardus*, *Henricus Gandauensis*, *Paludanus*, *Haurianus*, *Io. Maior*, *Siluester*, *Angelus de Perusio*, *Ioannes ab Anania*, whose places he cyteth out of their workes, & addeth the Ordinary Glosse, *ab omnibus nostris recepta*, receyued (saith he) by all our Canonists *in cap.* Ne quis 22. *quæst.* 2. *in locis infra q.* 2. *nu.* 10. *& duobus seq. citatis*: This writeth that renowned Doctor *Nauar*, who was held

Psal. 51.

Coment. humanæ aures q. nu. 9.

for no lesse scrupulous, tender and timerous of Conscience, then any other writer cõmonly in his dayes, as his austere manner of life did well testifie. And after him haue written and defended the same opinion, the most learned men for Scholasticall Deuinity in our age, as [a] *Franciscus Toletus*, [b] *Michael Salon*, [c] *Dominicus Bannes*, [d] *Gregorius de Valentia*, [e] *Ioannes Azorius*, [f] *Gregorius Sayer*, [g] *Franciscus Penia*, [h] *Tho. Sanchez*, all publicke Readers of Deuinity, and others, which for breuities sake I do omit, and shall passe to set downe breifly the proofes of this their opinion.

[a] *Lib. 3. c. 58. instruct.*
[b] *coment. in 2. 2. q. 69. art. 2.*
[c] *Ibidem.*
[d] *tomo. 3. disput. 5. q. 13. punct. 3.*
[e] *lib. 11. inst. moral. cap. 4.*
[f] *li. 12. c. 17. Clau. reg.*
[g] *Relatus à Bannes*
[h] *li. 8. de matrim. disput. 25. nu. 15.*

The argumentes and groundes of this common opinion. §. 4.

16. THE first is taken out of that we haue set downe before about the nature, & definition of truth and lying, that whensoeuer any speach, is cõforme in a true sense to the meaning of the speaker it is true, and not a lye; though the hearer should vnderstand it otherwise, especially when there is no obligation at all of satisfiying the said hearer, or demaunder as heere is presumed not to be, and consequently saith *Valentia*, a man may vtter any true proposition to himselfe, though neuer so impertinẽt to the demaund proposed by the vniust Iudge, as if there were no man present, or as if no such demaund had byn made at all: as for example, if a man that hath stolne, should say to himselfe alone, or to God truly & sincerely, I haue not stolne of malice or hatred to the person, but of need, or necessitie, or I haue not stolne of my owne inclination, but by induction of others, or I haue not stolne,

The first reason giuen by Gregory de Valentia.

ſtolne, ſo as I am bound to confeſſe it publickly, for that there is no witneſſe, proofe or preſumptiō againſt me, or the like: in all theſe ſpeaches the propoſition were true, *I haue not ſtolne*, though he reſerued the other pointes in his mynd vnuttered. It were true (I ſay) in it ſelfe, and in the ſight and eares of Almighty God, and conſequently no lye, whatſoeuer the vniuſt Iudges do conceaue therof, whoſe preſence, or demaundes in this caſe are nothing to be reſpected, but that the defendant may anſwere and ſpeake as though he (the ſaid Iudge) or other hearers that haue no authority to examin him were not there, ſo he vtter no falſity in it ſelfe.

17. And for confirmation of this is alleadged the Authority of *S. Auguſtine* in his booke *contra mendacium*, cyted by me before, about the nature of a myſterious ſpeach, that vttereth one thing in Wordes, and another in ſenſe, and yet is defended by *S. Auguſtine* to be no lye. *Quæ ſignificantur* (ſaith he) *vtique ipſa dicuntur. &c.* Thoſe thinges that are ſignifyed in a myſterious ſpeach are indeed truly ſpoken, but they are thought to be lyes, for that not the true thinges which are ſignifyed by that ſpeach are vnderſtood to be ſpoken, but thoſe that are falſe. So *S. Auguſtine*, wherby is euident that in his iudgement the nature of a lie cōſiſteth not in that it be held for a lye by others, or that the hearer be deceaued, but only that it agree not with the iudgement, and meaning of the ſpeaker, as before hath byn diſcuſſed.

S. Auguſtines authority. *Li. contr. mendac. cap. 10.*

18. But the authority of *S. Greg.* vrged by Doctor *Nauar* is more cleare, who in his bookes of *Morals* taking vpō him to defend the truth of certayne words of holy *Iob* againſt *Helin*, that calumniated the ſame ſaith: *Quid obeſt, ſi à rectitudine veritatis humano iudicio verba noſtra ſuperficie tenus diſcrepent, quando in cordis cardine ei cōpaginata concordent? &c.* What importeth it, if our wordes in

S. Gregory his authority. *S. Greg. li. 26. moral. cap. 10.*

„ outward shew do seeme to disagree from the rec-
„ tude of truth in mans iudgement, if in the hinge of
„ our hart, our said wordes be compact togeather, and
„ agree therunto? Mans eares do iudge of our wordes as
„ they sound outwardly, but Gods iudgement is ac-
„ cording as he seeth them come truly from our hart: he
„ knoweth that albeit mans will, and intention may be
„ declared or vttered in sundry formes of wordes; yet
„ that we ought not so much to consider wordes as the
said will, and intention of the speaker. So *S. Gregory*: wherby he sheweth euidently, that God considereth the hart, and intention of the speaker, and that when he hath a true sense, and meaning in the intention of his harte, though the same wordes seeme false vnto man, yet is it no lye in it selfe, or in the eares of almighty God, who iudgeth thinges as they be in themselues, and not as they are taken by man.

A rule for iustification of Equiuocall propositions vvith due circumstances.

19. An other foundation of the lawfulnes of this doctryne, is grounded vpon this rule, that when in any proposition that seemerh imperfect in sense, there may be supplied other particles, or causes for the perfect sense therof, out of the circumstances of place, tyme, and persons, both of the speaker, and hearer, (which clauses for iust reasons the speaker is not alwayes bound to expresse in wordes to the hearer) it is asmuch for the truth of the proposition, as if the said clauses were expressed; and it is the rule of Doctor *Bannes*, *Salon*, *Azorius*, and others, and it was touched before by *Iansenius* in the precedent Chapter, as a meane wherby to supply the vnperfect sense of many speaches of our Sauiour, as those, *I do not iudge any man: I do not ascend to this feast: The sonne of man knoweth not the day, and houre of Iudgement*, and the like: which speaches though in outward shew of wordes they seeme false; yet are they verified by the supplement of certayne reserued clauses not depending vpon euery

Bannes & Salon com. in 2. 2. q. 69. art. 3. Nauar li. 11. cap. 4. Ians. c. 9. punct. 3.

mans

mans priuate imagination and will, but such as may be gathered and truly applyed according to the said circumstances of tyme, place, persons, &c. as clauses agreable therevnto.

20. As heere, when the defendant that is guylty saith, *non feci, non vidi, non occidi, &c.* I haue not done it, I haue not seene him, I haue not killed him; if we consider only these bare wordes, and the iudges demaunde to whome it seemeth the defendant maketh these answers (though indeed he doth not but speaketh as if the other were not present at all) they are vntruthes, he hauing done it: but if we consider the circumstāces first of the person, that is iniuriously demaunded, and therby is not bound to answere at all to the others intention, but to his owne; and secondly the Iudge that presseth, and demaundeth vnlawfully, and therby deserueth to be deluded; and thirdly the tyme and place of iudgement, wherin the defendant contrary to law is vrged, eyther to accuse him selfe, or to escape by hauing some other meaning in his wordes, then is set downe: these circumstāces, I say, do easely defend the said speach from the nature of a lye, agreable to the matter, tyme and circumstances, shewing that somewhat is necessarily vnderstood, or reserued in mynde, which maketh the said proposition to be true in the speakers meaning, as hath byn shewed by many examples of Scriptures, and Fathers in the foregoing Chapters.

Hovv and vvith vvhat circūstances the accused may deny to haue done that vvhich he is not bound to vtter.

21. Wherfore all these Authours do conclude, that in the foresaid case, when iniurie is offred against lawe, and when no appellation or other refuge is permitted, nor any doubtfulnes of amphibologie or wordes can take place, then is the oppressed defendant to turne himselfe to almighty God the righteous Iudge of all, and framing to himselfe some true reserued sense, may say, I haue not done it, I haue not seene

ſeene him, I haue not killed him, and the like, vnderſtanding that he hath not done it ſo, as the examination or puniſhment therof is ſubiect to that tribunall, or he ſubiect to their iuriſdiction, wherby he is bound to vtter the ſame vnto him.

22. Neyther is this to deny a truth, or to lye, but to conceale ſome truth, which the defendant is not bound to vtter at that tyme, and to that man, and to vtter another, which is different from that. As for example he denyeth not, that he hath done the thing that he is demaunded, but not being bound to anſwere to that demaund, he ſaith, that he hath not done it in this or that maner, which is a truth not demaunded: neyther is this to lye, for that a lye is when the ſpeaker vttereth a thing which he knoweth to be falſe, as before we haue largly ſhewed, which in this caſe happeneth not, for that he knoweth that he ſpeaketh a truth in his owne meaning, and in the ſight of God, which alwayes he muſt do when he vſeth this euaſion, for that otherwiſe he ſhould lye, & commit ſynne, if he had not ſome true ſenſe reſerued in his mind, conformable to the matter, tyme, and place, and not feigned at randome as ſome fondly doe imagine.

Supra cap. 8.

23. Nor is this doctryne preiudicial to the common conuerſation of mans lyfe, as *Sepulueda* & ſome other haue obiected, for that this manner of Equiuocation as *Valentia*, *Sayer*, and other learned men haue noted, is not to be vſed without neceſsity, or vrgent cauſes, as particularly in iudgement, when the defendant is iniuſtly preſſed to anſwere, and when he hath right duty, band, or obligation to conceale the ſecret which the Iudge would know: but in common conuerſation, though it ſhould not be properly the ſyn of lying, for the reaſons aforeſaid, nor againſt the negatiue precept of truth; yet ſhould it be an other ſynne againſt the publick good of cyuill ſociety, and conſequently

Vſe of Equiuocation not preiudiciall to cõmon conuerſation.

quently against the affirmatiue precept of truth, bynding euery man to speake truth with his neighbour, according to the intention of the hearer, and demander, except he should demaund somwhat in preiudice of vs, and we had right to conceale the same. And thus much of this third case, wherby all the rest may in a sorte be determined.

The fourth case about VVitnesses. §. 5.

24. IN the fourth place ensueth the consideration of witnesses, who do testify in another mans cause, as the defendant doth in his owne; and consequently many thinges of those which before we haue touched concerning the said defendant, do appertaine also to witnesses. For first the common opinion and consent of Deuines is, that when any man is called to beare witnesse against another, before a lawful Iudge, who proceedeth rightfully, and according to forme of law doth demaund the truth of him, he is bound to vtter the same sincerely, and wholy vnder payne of mortall sinne, for the same reasons which we haue alleadged before, concerning the defendant; to wit, that the Iudge being in the place of almighty God, & of the Cōmon wealth, & demaunding him iustly, he is bound by the law of Iustice, subordination, and obedience, to reueale vnto him the sincere truth of all that he is demaunded, and knoweth in that behalfe.

D. Tho. 2.2.q.70. art.1. Caietan. Salon. Petrus de Aragon, Bannes in eum locū. Halens. part.3.q. 43.memb. 1.S.Antonin.p.2. tit.1.c.19. Sotus l.1. de iustitia cap.7. & alij.

25. Yea & further then this, he doth not only sinne mortally, as hath byn said, in denying, or concealing the truth or any parte therof necessary to be vttered: but is also bound in conscience to make restitution to the partie endamaged by his concealment of all those

losses either in fame, estimation, goods or otherwise which he hath suffered, and might haue auoyded, if the other had confessed the truth. So hold *Syluester, Nauar, Sotus, Salon, Bannes, Valentia*, and commonly all the rest. And this is the seuerity of Catholicke Doctrine, about obligation of witnesses for telling the truth, when they are called, and examined by a rightfull Iudge, extant in all our Authors, as hath bene said; and I would gladly know of T. *Morton* what his Deuinity doth define, and prescribe in this case, and what his Authors haue written therof for the practice; yea what the practice it self is there daily with him, in all mens sight: which point I thinke rather expedient to leaue to euery mans particuler knowledge, and conscience, to thinke & consider, then here to set downe, what fruites their new Ghospell hath brought forth in this matter about vnconscionable witnesses.

Obligatiō of witnesses to speak the truth.

26. But on the other side our Doctors say, that when the Iudge is not lawfull, or that he enquireth of secretes, which appertayne not to his iurisdiction, nor that forme of law doth permit him so to enquire, then the same Authors are of opinion, that he may refuse to answere, for that the Iudge hath no Authority to demaund him; yea although first he hath sworne to answere directly, for that, that oath did presuppose that he should answere directly to that which the other should iustly demaund of him, and therfore in this case he may vse the same kinds of refuge, which before haue byn touched in the case of the defendant, that is to say, he may hold his peace, or refuse to answere, or appeale from him or deny all in forme, as it lyeth, or vse doubtfull, or Equiuocall wordes, and other such manner of ordinary euasions, which if they preuaile not, then say these Doctors, that he may deny, and say, *nihil scio, nihil vidi, nihil audiui*, I know nothing, I haue seene nothing, I haue heard

How witnesses may deny or fly answering.

heard nothing, reſeruing in his mynd the other parte, that he knoweth nothing, hath ſeene nothing nor heard nothing, which in that iniuſt examination he is bound to vtter, as being demaunded againſt law, and iuſtice. And this ſhall be ſufficient for this caſe.

The fifth caſe about Equiuocation in ſwearing. §. 6.

27. THE fifth caſe that we meane to handle at this tyme is about Equiuocation in ſwearing, which act of ſwearing comprehending as before we haue ſaid a calling of God to witnes in that we affirme, as it is honourable to God when it is done with the foreſaid due circumſtances of *Truth*, *Iuſtice*, and *Reuerence*: ſo is it a greiuous ſinne when any of thoſe points do want, and eſpecially when truth, and iuſtice fayleth therin, it is the heynous ſinne, & cryme of periury, ſo greatly deteſted in Catholicke Doctrine as before hath byn declared in the ſeauenth and eight Chapters. Now only is to be conſidered, whether Amphibologie or Equiuocation may be vſed in an oath, or no, and how farre without deceipt, and whether he that ſweareth, be alwayes bound to ſweare to the intention of him to whom the Oath is made, or that ſometimes, and in ſome caſes, he may without falſhood, or periury, ſweare to his owne true intention, keeping the ſame ſecret from him that exacteth the oath. 5.

See ſupra cap. 7. & 8.

28. About which point they do determine firſt, that who ſoeuer offreth himſelf volũtarily to ſweare, that is to ſay, of his owne free-will and choiſe, he is bound vnder payne of mortall ſinne to ſweare truly, and di-

rectly *according to the intention & meaning of him to whome he sweareth: the reason wherof is, for that he swearing freely, and without compulsion, is bound to vtter the truth, and to follow the common vse of swearing, which is to sweare to the intention of him that exacteth the oath. And the same they determine, when any man is called, and commanded to sweare by his lawfull Iudge, and Superiour, and in a lawfull cause: and he that doth otherwise, though it were to the sauing of his owne, or another mans life, doth commit periury.

*See about this matter *Alex. Halen. p. 3. q. 31. m. 4. Nauar. in man ca. 12 nu 8. Sot. lib. 8. de Iust q. 1. art. 7. D. Tho. 2. 2. q. 89. art. 7. ad 4. Caie. & Aragõ ibi. Sylu. v. Iuramẽ. 3. q. 2. Cos. Philiar. de offic. Sacerd. p. 2 lib. 2. c. 14. Pedrazza in explic. 2. præcepti §. 2. Tolet. in sum. li. 4. ca. 21. & others.*

29. But if the Iudge that exacteth the oath be not a lawfull Iudge, or proceedeth not lawfully in exacting the same, then hath he that sweareth, no obligation to sweare to his intention at all, but may sweare to his owne, so he make no lye, but haue some true meaning and sense in his oath, according to the circumstances of the place, tymes, matters, and persons before mentioned. Of which point I thinke good to alleadge heere the wordes of a great Schoole-Deuine, that hath written in our age, called by *Morton* the *Great Moralist*, who proposing diuers rules concerning the subiect of taking an oath, setteth downe his second rule thus: *Secunda regula* (saith he) *est, si reus à Iudice contra, vel præter ius rogetur de crimine occultè patrato, &c.* The second rule is that if the defendant should be demaunded an oath by the Iudge about a secret cryme committed by him, and this contrary or besides the order of law, he may with a secure conscience answere, and sweare that he hath not committed that cryme, nor knoweth any thing of it: the reason of which rule is, not that which some men do giue, that it is lawfull for vs, when we sweare, to take wordes in our sense at our pleasure, or as wee feigne them our selues, otherwise then the hearers vnderstand them; but this only is the true reason, that when our

Azor. li. 11 instit. c. 4.

The discours of Azor, about Equiuocation in an oath

wordes

wordes may haue an ambiguous signification, we may ,,
take them in what sense we will, when we are vrged ,,
against law, though the hearers take them in another ,,
sense. And wheras the ambiguity of our wordes may ,,
arise from diuers heades, aswell of their significations, ,,
of the circumstances of time, place, persons, manner ,,
of proceeding, and the like before mentioned; wee ,,
may out of these verify our speach. As for example, ,,
when a priest denyeth to any Iudge that he knoweth ,,
of any Cryme in Confession, which is a diuine iudg- ,,
ment and tribunall, it is vnderstood by the circum- ,,
stance of his office, that no such crymes are to be en- ,,
quired of in that humane court or iudgement. And so ,,
when the defendant denyeth that he hath done this, ,,
or that secret cryme, though he seeme to deny it ab- ,,
solutly; yet the circumstance of the place, action, and ,,
persons may easely declare, if a man looke into them, ,,
that his true meaning may be, that he hath done no ,,
such thing, as ought to be enquired in that manner or ,,
vttered publickly in that tribunall. ,,

30. So he in this and all other like cases: about which ,,
this general foundation is held by the foresaid De- ,,
uines; and related by our Countreyman *Sayer* in his *Sayer lib. 5. Clau. Reg. ca. 4. nu. 13.*
Cases of conscience in these wordes. *Interrogatus à Iudice incompetente. &c.* He that is examined by an incompe- ,,
tent Iudge, or if he be competent and lawfull, yet ,,
doth he not proceed lawfully, & according to forme ,, The discours of *Sayer* to the same effect.
of law, as examining him of secret synnes, or matters, ,,
or circumstances impertinēt to the cause, then in that ,,
case is he not obliged to sweare according to the in- ,,
tention of the said Iudge, that offereth the oath; nor ,,
on the other syde may he lye, or sweare against his ,,
owne intention, or true meaning, for that he should ,,
synne deepely, and incurre periury; but he may ,,
when he is thus pressed, and cannot otherwise auoid ,,
the violence, and iniury offered vnto him, so accom- ,,

„ modate his wordes, as they may be true according to
„ his owne intention, and in the sight of God, though
„ they be false according to the intention of him that
„ doth iniustly exact the oath; and in so answering he
„ lyeth not, nor incurreth periury, though the said
„ Iudge be deceaued. For that *S. Thomas* well noteth the
„ formall, and essentiall reason of a lye consisteth not in
„ the intention of the speaker, to leaue the hearer de-
„ ceaued, for that otherwise he should lye whosoeuer
„ should vse doubtfull and equiuocall wordes to hide a
„ truth (which both *S. Thomas*, *S. Augustine* and other De-
„ uines do deny) but it consisteth in this, that a thing is
„ otherwise spoken then is in the mynd of the speaker,
„ *vnde mentiri, est contra mentem ire*, to ly, is to go against
„ a mans owne mynd, as *before hath sufficiently byn
declared. Thus *Sayer*.

* *Supra cap.* 8.

Diuers other Cases in particuler. §. 7.

31. AND now in the last place shall we lay togea-
ther some few seuerall cases, which vpon these
and like rules, reasons, and principles, Schoole-De-
uines do resolue. And the first shalbe that case, which
our Minister *Morton* so often proposeth, and odiously
doth exagerate about *Couentry*, saying: That our En-
glish Equiuocators do teach, that if a man come from
Couentry, which towne is held to be infected with the
plague, himselfe dwelling in a parte of that Cittie
„ which is free from infection, and being asked at *Lon-*
„ *don-gates*, whether he came from *Couentry*, they inten-
„ ding to aske him concerning a place infected, he may
„ answere no, for that herein he deceaueth not the
„ mynd of the questioner, but answereth directly to his
inten-

Tho. Mortons case of Couentry.

intention. So propoundeth he the case, as he pretendeth out of the Catholike treatise of *Equiuocatiõ*, which hitherto I haue not seene, and consequently cannot affirme how truly or falsely the same is related: but he hauing so vttered the said case, doth in opposition therof cyte the forsaid Iesuite *Azor* his sentece against this, as though he said that if we admit this case: *Nihil tam falsum esse posse, quod non queat ab omni mendacio liberari*: nothing is so false, but that it may be freed from a lye; which wordes are indeed in *Azor*, but not applyed by him to this case, but to another, saying: That if it were lawfull for vs, to feigne what words we would in an oath without regard to the circumstances of tyme, place, and persons before mentioned, then nothing were so false in deed, that might not be freed from all lying: but this case of ours goeth not conioyned with these wordes of *Azor*, as *Morton* hath perfidiously heer tyed them togeather, but *Azor* speaking twice of this our case in one page, first in the name of others by way of obiection, and againe in his owne name by way of resolution; he saith; *Libenter concedimus de eo, qui ad portas Vrbis rogatur, &c.* we do willingly grant the example of him who coming to the gates of a Citty, and being asked whether he came from a certayne place, which by errour is thought to be infected with the plague, and is not; *tutò citra mendacium iurare potest, se ex eo loco non venire*, he may securely sweare without lying, that he cometh not from that place; so as, he vnderstand that he cometh not from any place infected with plague, nor that himselfe is infected. This is *Azor* his iudgement and resolution. And before him this case was so resolued by *Doctor Syluester, Nauar, Tolet, Roderiquez, Cosmus Philiarchus*, and diuers other learned men, as after him also by our often-named Countreyman *Gregorius Sayer*: and the reason of the lawfulnes of this answere is, for that the

Azor. lib. 11. inst. c. 4 §. Primo quidem.

Azo. ib. §. Tertia regula.

Syl. v. Iuramentū 3. q. 2. Nauar. in manual. c. 12. nu. 19.

an-

Tolet. in Instruct. Sacer. c. 21 lib. 4. Roder. in summa p. 1. ca. 191. concl. 4. Cosmus Phil. p. 2. lib. 3. c. 14. Sayer lib. 5. c. 4. nu. 22.

answerer being sure, that either the place is not infected from whence he came, or that himselfe hath brought no infection about him (for otherwise he should be periured) it were great iniury vnto him to be stayed at the Gate without cause, and therfore for declyning this iniury and iniustice, it is lawfull for him to answere to the finall end, and intention of the keeper, and of the Cittie or Common-wealth (whose intention only is to exclude infected people) and not to their immediate words about the particuler place.

32. And now all this being so, consider I pray yow, the shameless forhead of this deceauing Minister, in cyting *Azor* quite against himselfe, and his owne sense and meaning, and tying his wordes togeather that were spoke̅ separatly to another end: & yet as though he had played no such iuggling tricke, but had gotten some victorie ouer vs, heare his insolent speach about this answere sett downe by so many learned men as you haue heard named: *An answere* (saith he) *so grossely false, that a Iesuite of high esteeme in your Church* (to witt Azor) *writing against this spirituall iuggling of his subtile-lying-brethren doth confesse, that if this kind of answere concerning a place infected with the plague, &c. be not false, then there is no speach so false, but it may be freed from falshood, by whom your Equiuocators* (saith he) *may learne that if the man yow fancied came not from a place infected with bodily pestilence, yet this your Equiuocating proceedeth from myndes spiritually infected with the contagion of pestilent lying.* So he.

Egregious impudẽcy of T.M.

33. And I do willingly remit my selfe to the indifferent Reader, where this contagion of *pestiling lying* raigneth, either in these graue learned men, that haue decyded this question without lying, & against lying, or in *Morton*, that hath multiplied so many lyes togeather in this place, as is a shame to number them? For besides all that I haue noted already, he corrupteth also heere the very text of *Azor*, which himself allea-

geth

geth in his margent, by tranſlating it falſely into Engliſh, wheras *Azor* ſaith in the Caſe propoſed, *Si venit ex loco aliquo peſte minimè infecto, qui falsò habetur pro infecto*, he Engliſheth the ſame by leauing out the wordes *minimè* and *falsò*, ſayng; *If he come from a place infected*, which altereth the whole caſe. For if either the place, or himſelfe be infected, he cannot ſweare without periury as hath byn ſayd. Secondly he ſaith that *Azor* the Ieſuite doth write againſt *the ſpirituall iuggling of his ſubtile-lying-brethren*, and yet are neyther the principall Authors of this anſwere and reſolution *Ieſuites*, as by their names you haue heard, nor writeth *Azor* againſt them, but with them, and for them in this caſe, conforming his iudgement as yow ſee, to theirs, that a man coming from ſuch a place, may iuſtly ſweare in the forme that byn ſaid. Nor is their anſwere *ſubtile-iuggling* as the miniſter ſlandereth, but plaine, & reall dealing, yeelding their reſolution togeather with the reaſon therof, as hath byn declared. And all the *iuggling* is on *Mortons* ſyde, who declaming againſt *lying*, doth nothing but lye: and yet finaly concludeth moſt ridiculouſly his ſpeach thus: *Therfore be yow exhorted for the loue of God, who is truth, to retant your doctrine of Equiuocating, the Metropolis of lyes.* Wherunto my anſwere is, that in my opinion *Thomas Morton* is well worthy to be *Metropolitane* of that *Metropolis*. For if euer man honeſt or vnhoneſt, lay or Clergie, learned or vnlearned, (to vſe his manner of exaggerations) did tell ſo many lyes togeather and in print, & within the compaſſe of ſo few lynes, as *Morton* heere hath done, I am much deceyued. For yet he hath not done, but preſently after the former lyes, vttered againſt *Azor* he proceedeth to do the ſame with others alſo, and namely againſt *Dominicus Sotus* in theſe wordes.

Diuerſe groſſe vntruthes of T. M.

T. M. Metropolitan of his lying Metropolis.

34. Behold (ſaith he) one Doctor among you ſo ſubtile, that for that faculty, he hath by figure of ex- Pag. 59.

„ cellency, byn called, *The subtile Doctor*, who doth con-
„ clude all your Equiuocators for liars, saying; to say
„ that I did not that which I know I haue done, al-
„ though I speake it with this limitation, or reseruation
„ of mynd, *vt tibi significē*, it is not Equiuocatiō but a lye.

Sotus li. 5. de iust. q. 6. art. 2.

And then he quoteth *Sotus* in his bookes *De iure iustitia*, setting downe also in the margēt the latin wordes conforme to this. But all is treachery, falshood, and lying in this impertinent impugner of Equiuocation. For first by the *Subtile Doctor*, according to the phrase of Catholicke Schooles, euery Child knoweth to be meant *Ioannes Scotus* & not *Dominicus Sotus* which liued more then 200. yeares after the other, and was of the Order of *S. Dominicke*, the other being of *S. Francis*; so as this is fooliſh and ridiculous errour, if it be errour: but the other is clearly false, and malitious, that these wordes as heere they are cited are in *Sotus*, which *Morton* will neuer be able to shew, for sauing his honesty in this point; and much lesse will he be able to proue, that *Sotus doth conclude all Equiuocators for lyars*, which is an other incredible impudency in him to affirme, for that *Sotus* in this very booke, question, and article by him cited doth teach & proue largely the playne contrary, to witt, *that to Equiuocate is lawfull in diuers cases*, to which effect we haue cited him before, when he saith in generall: *Possunt & debent sic contra ius requisiti quacunque vti amphibologia*. They which are vnlawfully required to speake or sweare as we haue declared, may and ought to vse any kynd of Amphibologie, or Equiuocation.

Sotus falsly abused by T. M.

35. This is his generall assertion, but afterward in particuler he putteth many exāples to proue the same. And first he serteth downe this proposition, *dum testis de alieno actu interrogatur, potest ritè respondere se nescire*;

„ when a witnesse is (*vnlawfully*) demaunded of an other
„ mans action which he knoweth, he may iustly an-

swere

ſwere he knoweth nothing. The reaſon wherof he ſaith is this; *Quia oratio illa, neſcio, recipere hunc ſenſum citra mendacium poteſt, neſcio, vt tibi modò dicam:* for that the anſwere *I know nothing therof*, may without falſity admit this ſenſe, *I know it not to tell it yow at this time, ſicut filius hominis neſcit diem iudicij, vt dicat*, as Chriſt knew not the day of Iudgment to tell, or vtter it to his diſciples. And doth it ſeeme to yow that *Sotus* in this place doth go about to conclude all Equiuocators for lyars, as *Morton* affirmeth? If he did, he concludeth our Sauiour Chriſt alſo in his ſenſe. What extreme impudency is this in a Miniſter? But let vs heare *Sotus* yet further in this matter. Mar. 13.

36. In his booke *de tegendo ſecreto, his third member, and third queſtion*, he repeateth againe the very ſame concluſion heere mencioned, that a witnes being vniuſtly demaunded whether he knoweth ſuch and ſuch a thing of an other, may anſwere he knoweth nothing, though he ſecretly know it: and then going further, he demaundeth, whether I hauing ſeene *Peter* kyll *Iohn*, & being afterward examined vpon the ſame iniuſtly, whether I may ſay *I know nothing therof*? To which he giueth this anſwere: *Reſpondetur quod iure poſſum reſpondere* neſcio, *quia iure intelligitur* neſcio, *vt dicam, aut* neſcio *eo modo quo iure debeam dicere.* I affirme (ſaith he) that I may rightly anſwere, *I know nothing therof*, for that by law it is vnderſtood that I know it not to tell it, or I know it not in ſuch manner, as by law I ought to vtter the ſame. And preſently he refuteth *Tho. Mortons* Doctor *Geneſius Sepulueda*, that calleth this *pulchrum commentum*, a faire gloſſe, and putting him in number of *iuniores quidam*, certayne yonger fellowes, that would reprehend that which they vnderſtood not, ſaith: *Hi aut non capiunt, aut diſſimulant vim argumenti:* theſe (yonglings) either do not vnderſtand, or do diſſemble the force of the argumẽt for this our doctrine.

Sotus expreſly impugneth T. M. *Lib. de tegen. ſecreto m. 3. q. 3. Concluſ. 4.*

Tho. Mortons Doctor Geneſius refuted by Sotus.

And this note giuen to *Thomas Mortons* Doctor *Genesius* by so graue a man as *Sotus* was, may easely wype out his authority about this matter of Equiuocation, if in some thinges he dissent from the rest, that were far more learned Deuines then himself: about whome notwithstanding I cannot but meruaile why *Thomas Morton*, in cyting him, doth adorne him with this strange tytle *your Deuine of Colē*, for so much as we read not, that euer he was at *Colen*, but was borne at *Corduba* in *Spayne*, and there dyed, though for many yeares he liued in *Italy*: but whether he did euer looke vpon *Colen* or no I know not, & cōsequently I would gladly know *Thomas Mortons* mysterie in naming him so confidently *our Deuine of Colen*. But whatsoeuer his mysterie might be in this, sure it is, that his *Mysterie* was and is apparant in being taken in so many liues, about *Sotus* and *Azor*, as heere he hath byn.

37. And now for that we haue byn ouer long in this one example, drawne out by the multiplicity of *Mortons* manifold vntruthes, we shall breifly touch an example or two more and so make an end. A wyfe being demaunded by her husband, that is no competent Iudge, and compelled to sweare, whether she be an adultereſſe, or no, may lawfully sweare, if the sinne be secret, (say our Doctors) that she is not, vnderstanding, VT TIBI REVELEM, *that I am bound to reueale it vnto yow*, and therby auoid the danger that otherwise she were like to incurre. In which resolution, though *Sotus* do somwhat differ from the rest, as also about the answere of a defendant in his owne act, whether he may say absolutly, he hath not done it, or no, as before in the third Case hath byn debated; yet doth *Doctor Nauarre* at large proue that she may answere truly so, as a prieſt may answere also in matters of Confession by *Sotus* owne rule, though the Cases be different in other pointes. And with

The case of secret aduowtry.

a Nauar do concurre in this b Syluester, c Lopez d Cosmus Philiarthus e Angelus de Clauatio f Pedrazza, & Tolet h Azor, and others.

38. An other Case is that a man hauing borrowed an hundred pondes of another, and payd him againe, but being not able to proue the said payment in iudgment, and therupon forced by the Iudges to sweare that he will pay an hundred poundes by such a day, he is not forsworne if he pay him not, or haue no intention to pay him: for that in his oath, *Soluam*, I will pay him, is vnderstood by law, and by the very circumstance of the thing it selfe, that I will pay him: so much as I owe him, for that this also must be presumed to haue byn the true intention of the Iudge, according to right and law, though otherwise by his externall actuall iudgement he bound him to pay it absolutly.

a Nauar com. in c. humanæ aures. q. 2. nu. 9.
b v. iuramq. 2.
c p. 1. c. 42.
d de offic. p. 2. li. 3. cap. 14.
e v. iuram. 4. distin. 1.
f in explic. præcep. 2. §. 3.
g li. 4. instit. c. 21. notab. 2.
h li. 10. instit. c. 4.

39. Many more such like cases and examples might be added, but it were ouer long. The substance of Schoole-doctrine in this poynt, & of Canon-lawers is, *That when a man is offered iniury, or iniustly vrged to vtter a secret*, that without his hurt or losse, or publicke damage he may not do; then is it lawfull for him without lying or periury, to answere eyther in word or oath, according to his owne intention and meaning, so it be true, though the hearer be deceaued therwith: But whersoeuer this iniury is not offered, nor violence vsed, or that he hath liberty to sweare or not sweare as in common conuersation and traffique it falleth out, ther is he alwayes bound to sweare according to the intention of him to whom he sweareth, and this vnder payne of periury, and much more, where the Equiuocation may turne to the hurt of others that offer him no iniury, nor cannot force him to sweare against his will. This is the resolution of Catholike-schoole-

The cõclusion of all this Chapter.

Doctors, vpon the groundes which before yow haue heard, both of reaſon, equity, Scriptures and Fathers againſt the vnlearned clamors of a few Engliſh miniſters, that out of emulation and ignorance doe impugne the ſame without proofe at all. And this ſhall ſuffice for this Chapter.

THE

THE ARGVMENTS AND REASONS OF THO. MORTONS BOOKE are examined, and answered: AND *His notorious errors, follyes, and falsifications therin discouered.*

CHAP. XI.

ALBEIT whatsoeuer hath hitherto byn said, and written by vs about this subiect of *Equiuocation*, hath byn in reprose of *Thomas Mortons* reasons and arguments against the same; yet haue I not thought it amisse in this place, to looke ouer his booke againe, and to bring againe into the Readers sight by way as it were of methodicall repetition, whatsoeuer substáce he pretendeth to haue in this affaire: which though it be so small that it is scarce worth the repetition; yet may the reuiew therof make some impression, what

manner

maner of people they are, that take vpon them to write bookes at this day in England againſt Catholiekes, and to be Maiſters and directors of others, that are ſo ignorant, and farre out of the way themſelues.

2. Firſt then to pretermit the fond exaggerations, vſed by him in the beginning of this booke, which vpon ſome occaſions I haue touched before, intituling the ſame, *Againſt more then heathnish Equiuocation*, and in another place, *Againſt the doctrine of ſacrilegious Equiuocation*: and yet futther, *Againſt the impious conceipt of Equiuocation*; and laſtly, *Againſt the wicked doctrine of Equiuocation, againſt the new-bred-hydra, and vggly monſter, a peece of the black art, the myſtery of iniquity*, and the like: we ſhall breifly go to the ſubſtance of the matter, for now already yow haue ſeene how vaine, and childith theſe termes are, and much more that aſſeueration, *That no iota in all Scripture, no one example in all antiquity, no one reaſon in all the naturall wit of man is to be found for profe, or colour of any lwwfull vſe of Equiuocation.* Yow haue ſeene (I ſay) how light and vaine theſe wordes of his are, and haue pittyed (I thinke) the poore mans ouerſight in vttering them, foraſmuch as ſo many Scriptures, ſo many Fathers, ſo many Doctors, and graue learned men, both in Law and Deuinity, ſo many euident reaſons and arguments, haue byn alleadged for the iuſt vſe therof, in due occaſions, tymes, matters, and places, as no modeſty can maintayne the former fond and childiſh vaunts to the contrary.

Confut. pag 1.

Pag. 97. Pag. 47.

Childish rayling.

3. To haſten then to the matter, I am firſt to admoniſh the reader, that wheras this Miniſter doth take vpon him to confute a certaine Catholicke manuſcript Treatiſe, made in defence of *Equiuocation*, and intercepted (as it ſeemeth) by them, I could neuer yet come to the ſight therof, and therfore muſt be forced to admitt, what he ſaith out of it, without controlment, heere a peece, & there a peece; though there be di-

be diuers coniectures, that he, as in other matters, ſo in this, dealeth very vnfaithfully: partly for that ſuch peeces as heere are alleadged, do not ſeeme well to hang togeather, or to haue any due connexion: and partly alſo for that I hauing taken *Thomas Morton* in ſo many falſifications, of thinges alleadged by him, as before yow haue ſeene, and that the law ſaith, *VVhoſoeuer is once euill, is preſumed to be euill ſtill*, vntill he proue the contrary: I muſt in a manner aſſure my ſelfe, that the miniſter hath vſed notable *legier-de mains*, in citing the ſentences, and textes of this Catholicke Treatiſe, which I haue hope to ſee ere it be long, and if it come in time, I may chance by ſome appendix, to giue yow more notice of the particulers.

4. This then preſuppoſed, we come to the chiefe pointes of his whole Treatiſe, which coſiſteth as yow haue heard of two concluſions. The firſt, *that euery Equiuocation by a mentall reſeruation, is not a hidden truth, but a groſſe lye*: The ſecond, *that euery Equiuocation whether mentall or verball, if it be vſed in an oath, though it be no lye, yet is it an abhominable prophanation of that ſacred inſtitution of God &c.* And for proofe of theſe two concluſions, he alleadgeth ſeuerall argumentes, which heere we ſhall diſcuſſe in order, to wit, ſeauen for the firſt, and foure for the later. His argumentes for the firſt are theſe. 1. The definition of a lye. 2. The definition of Equiuocation. 3. The deſcription of lying. 4. The nature of periury. 5. Truth God, lying the Diuell. 6. Scriptures Fathers Pagans. 7. Signe, interpretations, coyne, Giges ring. And for the ſecond concluſion he bringeth 4. argumentes. 1. The forme of an oath. 2. The end of an oath. 3. *A minore* from the leſſe to the more. 4. *A paribus*, or from thinges equall. And now ſhall you ſee one by one, how equally vaine, and of no force all theſe argumentes be.

Pag. 49. Tvvo propoſitions the groũds of his booke.

The firſt argument from the definition of a lye. §. 1.

Pag 50. 5. NOVV muſt we come (ſaith he) into the liſtes of this conflict, and enter vpon our Equiuocator, to conuince him a groſſe liar, by manifeſt argumentes. *Maior.* Whoſoeuer vſeth any ſignification of ſpeach againſt his conſcience, is properly a lyer: *Minor.* But our Equiuocator doth vſe ſignification of ſpeach directly againſt his cõſcience, *Ergo* he is directly a lier. The *Minor* is not only the confeſsion, but alſo the profeſsion of our Equiuocator, who ſaith, that if a Catholicke being demaunded before a Magiſtrate, vpon his oath whether a prieſt be in his houſe, he may contrary to his perfect knowledge, anſwere no; and can any man of conſcience deny this concluſion? Yet becauſe we haue to deale againſt Conſciences dawbed vp with morter vntempered, wee adde a confirmation of the former argument. So he.

6. And I haue thought good to lett him play his parte ſomwhat largely in this firſt argument, to the end you may know him the better in the reſt. You ſee how he entereth with menacing wordes, and then how he maketh a ſillogiſme, & when he ſhould proue his *Minor* propoſition, that wee deny, to witt, *that euery one that vſeth Equiuocation doth vſe a ſignification of ſpeach directly againſt his conſcience*, he ſaith, that we do not only confeſſe, but profeſſe the ſame. And how doth he proue this? Forſooth for that we hold that a Catholicke being examned whether he haue a prieſt in his houſe, he may anſwere no, though he know he be there.

His firſt argumẽt confuted.

there. But now this ſimple fellow doth know before this time, if he hath read that which in the precedent Chapters we haue written, that the negatiue, no, in this anſwere doth not fal only vpon thoſe wordes vttered, but vpon my whole meaning, and reſerued propoſition, and conſequently doth not ſignifye, *that I know no prieſt to be there*, but, *that I do not know him ſo to be there as I am bound to vtter him*, as *S. Iohns*, no, to the Phariſies did not ſignify that he was no Prophet at all, but that he was no ſuch Prophet as they imagined.

7. Wherfore it is great folly for him heere to ſay, that we both *confeſſe* and *profeſſe*, that when we vſe Equiuocal ſpeach in a reſerued propoſition, we ſpeake againſt our knowledge, & conſcience. For we ſpeake as we thinke, and as we thinke truly both in our meaning, and in the ſight of God, though the hearer by his owne default, as proceeding vniuſtly, be permitted to be deceaued: ſo as, when I ſay, *I haue no prieſt in my houſe* reſeruing in mynd this other clauſe, *which I ought, and am bound to vtter vnto yow*, is a true propoſition, and truly meant by me, and not contrary, but conforme to my knowledge, & conſcience: which being vnderſtood, all the *daubing with morter* which the miniſter *Morton* bringeth in heere out of our owne Authors (for other (poore man) he hath none) to patch vp his contradiction withall, diſſolueth of it ſelfe, and falleth to the ground, as meere daubing in deed. For firſt we graunt the definition of lying, alledged out of the *Maiſter of Sẽtences*, which is: *Lying is when a man ſpeaketh any thing, contrary to that which he thinketh in his mynd*: for in this propoſition of ours I thinke as I ſpeake, for I thinke and know that I haue no prieſt in my houſe, which I ought to diſcouer. Secondly wee admit alſo the definition of *S. Thomas of Aquin*: *A lye is when a man will ſignify in outward wordes, another thing then that which he hath in his mynd*, which in our caſe we do not. We

Lib. 3. diſtinct. 38.

2.2.q. 111. art. 1.

admit alſo the ſaying of *S. Auguſtine* heere alleadged, *that the former property of periurie is to ſweare that, which I thinke is falſe.* ●

Lib. de mend. c. 5. & ſer 28. de verb. Apoſt. & apud D. Tho. 2. 2. q. 98. art. 1.

8. And now *Thomas Morton* hauing alleadged theſe authorityes out of our owne Doctors, as yow ſee, and making nothing for him, but altogeather for vs, he paſſeth on to vrge vs with his wiſe *Socraticall* interrogatoryes, wherof we haue made mention* before, and maketh this preface thervnto.

**Supra Cap. 9. Pag. 51.*

9. Now muſt we examine (ſaith he) whether that
» we haue not by this proofe ſo intrapped the Fox
» Equiuocator, that he cannot find any hole wherby to
» eſcape. Suffer me Socratically to debate this point
» with you & anſwere me frendly to theſe demaundes
» *&c.* Which childiſh trifling, for that we haue anſwered ſufficiently before, we ſhall ſay no more in this place. And this is all he hath of any ſubſtance in this argument.

His ſecond argument from the definition of Equiuocation. §. 2.

10. INTO this argument alſo he entreth with like vaunt, as in o the former; *That if euer any Logitian, whether Infidel, or belieuer did allow a mixt propoſitiõ partly mentall, and partly verball, I will* (ſaith he) *which my ſoule vtterly deteſteth, be an Equiuocator* But to this folly hath byn anſwered ſufficiently before in the eight Chapter, where his groſſe ouerſight is diſcouered in this childiſh vaunt. Wherfo e he goeth forward ſaying:

Pag 54.

» But I muſt not now expect impoſsibilities from you,
» to try what you would proue, but ſhew heerin what I can

I can diſproue. Your propoſition, *I am no prieſt*, mixed „
with your mentall reſeruation, *to reueale it vnto yow*, if „
it be true, it is either in his ſimple ſignification, or by „
vertue of Equiuocation: but it is true in his ſimple „
ſignification: This yow graunt. Neither can it be true „
by vertue of Equiuocation: This I proue.

11. Well Syr, we ſhall ſee preſently your proofe for this ſecond point, but in the meane ſpace we deny the former, which yow ſay we grant, but do alleadge no proofe for it. For who is ſo ſimple, as to grant that this whole propoſition, *I am no prieſt bound to reueale it vnto yow, or no prieſt ſubiect vnto your iuriſdiction*, is not a true propoſition in his owne ſimple ſignification? For it ſignifyeth to me ſimply, and plainly, that I am not a prieſt ſubiect to ſeculer mens examination, according to Canonicall and Eccleſiaſticall lawes: how then do we grant that the propoſition is not true, in his ſimple ſignification, or where is that grant regiſtred? Is not this great ſimplicity, to preſume a grant and to plead that grant in print, wheras the thing is euidently denyed? Who would argue thus but *Thomas Morton*? But let vs ſee your proofe in the ſecond, ſeeing yow faile ſo much in the firſt.

His ſecõd anſvvere confuted.

12. *Equiuocation* ſay yow) in word or ſpeach, according to *Ariſtotle* the Oracle of Logitians, is when one word or one ſpeach, doth equally ſignifie diuers things, as when one ſhall ſay, *I am afraid of a dogge*, this word *dogge* hath a triple ſignification, &c. This hath byn examined before in the ſeauenth Chapter, where it is ſhewed, how yow abuſe *Ariſtotle* in this place, by making him to define *Equiuocation* in generall by a part; that is to ſay the definition of one, among three manners or degrees of *Equiuocatiõ* there by him ſet downe, wherby alſo yow deſtroy vnawares your owne cauſe: for that if this be the definition of *Equiuocation* in generall, then cannot our reſerued propoſition

Ibidem. *Ariſt Elench. li. 1. cap. 4.* „

haue any equiuocation in it at all, for that the wordes and ſpeech haue no double, but ſimple ſignification of themſelues, and conſequently yow do accuſe vs vniuſtly of equiuocating, in vſing this anſwere, wherof alſo your ſelf ſay preſently after: But your mixt and
» patched propoſition is not one word or ſpeach, ſignifying equally diuers things, but contrarily diuers
» partes of ſpeach, one in the mynd, and another in the
Pag. 55. mouth, which whoſoeuer ſhall call equiuocall, may
» be iuſtly ſuſpected to be bytten with the higheſt
» dogg, the propoſition is ſo abſurd, and vnreaſonable.

13. And now (good Syr) what will yow proue by all this? That our mixt reſerued propoſitions are not ambiguous, doubtfull, and equiuocall? And why then (I pray yow) do yow call vs Equiuocators? yea *hellish* and *heathnish Equiuocators* for vſing the ſame? Who is like rather to be bitten of the *higheſt dogg*, eyther we or yow that cannot tell what yow ſay or proue, eyther for yow, or againſt your ſelfe? We haue ſtood hithertoto defend thoſe mixt propoſitiõs againſt your imputations of *hellish*, *heathenish*, *impious*, and *ſacrilegious Equiuocations*; and now yow take vpon yow to proue, that they are not equiuocall at all, and that *they are bitten with the higheſt dogg*, that ſay ſo: and yow are ſo earneſtly ſett to proue it, as yow dare aduenture to corrupt *Ariſtotles* owne text, to make ſome ſhew therof, not only in choice of the definition before mentioned; but in the very wordes alſo of his Greeke text heere cyted, where yow ſay that *Equiuocation* is in any one word, or one ſpeach that doth equally ſignifie diuers things, and by vrging theſe *ones*, yow exclude our mixed propoſitions, for that they are not *one word*, nor *one ſpeach* as yow ſay, but diuers partes of ſpeach, whereas *Ariſtotle* hath neyther of theſe *ones* in his text, as the Greeke wordes alleadged in the margent do ſhew, but are foiſted in by *Morton* to ouerthrow himſelfe.

T M impugneth himſelfe.

Homonymía 'estìn hótan ho lógos e'e t'ónoma kyríoos seemaínei pleíoo.

And

And is not this like to be the bytting of a doggish influence indeed?

14. Wherfore to conclude, this argument is against himselfe, who vnderstãdeth not the state of his owne question, and therfore for instruction of the Reader, I say, that albeit these mixt reserued propositions be not properly equiuocall, in the sense that *Aristotle* did define his three degrees of *Equiuocation*, by wordes, custome or construction (which * before we haue related) for that they do not of themselues, nor their owne natures, signifye equally diuers things, but being vnderstood wholy haue a single and simple signification in the mynd, and vnderstanding of the speaker: yet for that the hearer conceauing but one parte therof, apprehendeth a different sense from the speaker, they may *ab effectu* be called ambiguous, amphibologicall, and equiuocall after a large, and improper manner of equiuocation, for that they leaue a different sense in the hearer, and speaker, albeit of themselues, as I haue said, they be playne, cleere, and true to them that heare them out, or do cõceaue the mentall reseruation, as God, and the speaker do. And this shall suffice for the second argument.

Arist. lib. Elenc. c. 4.
* Cap 8.

How reserued propositions are equiuocall & how not.

His third argument from the description of lying. §. 3.

15. YOVV haue seene his first argument to haue byn deduced from the definition of a lye, and now this his third is from the description of lying: what great difference do yow imagine there may be betweene lye and lying; why had he not drawne one argument

gument at least from the definition of truth, as we haue done diuers before against him? But let vs heare the method of his arguing, thus it goeth. *Maior.* No man doubteth (saith *S. Augustine*) but that he lyeth, which speaketh any thing which is false with intent to deceaue another. *Minor.* But our Equiuocators professe by a false speach to delude Protestant examiners, &c. *Ergo*, by their art of equiuocating haue they obteyned a perfection of lying. What can yow answere? So he.

'*Supra cap. 8.*

Aug. li. de mendacio c. 4. & 5.

16. And my answere is, that I would gladly haue this great disputer to proue his *Minor* proposition, and not to suppose it, and say we professe it, as he did in his first argument, wheras we deny it, or that in our foresaid proposition we speake false with intent to deceaue, for we speake a truth, as often before hath bene declared; nor is our intent to deceaue, but to defend our selues, when iniury is offered, and to permit the iniust examiner to be deceaued. And so for that this hath bene amply proued, and declared before, and this poore Cauiller bringeth nothing at all of new, to proue the said *Minor* proposition, but fondly supposeth vs to graunt it, which we vtterly deny as false: we shall say no more of this argument, but take pitty of the disputer, who calling vpon vs so freshly for our answere, is brought with one simple denyall to an euident *Non plus.* For as for his impertinent running into the example of *Couentry* infected, and one that commeth from thence, the case hath byn handled so sufficiently in the precedent Chapter, and our Aduersary conuinced of so many notable vntruthes therin, as there needeth no more to be spoken of that matter, wherfore we passe to the fourth argument.

His third argument confuted.

Supra c. 8. & 9.

In the 6. Case.

His fourth argument is taken à ſpecie, or from a particular kind of lying, which is Periury. §. 4.

17. THIS man as yow ſee cannot yet get out of lying and periury, and by naming them only as impugned by him, he thinketh to credit his owne cauſe, and diſcredit ours, wheras in deed by practiſing eyther one or both in this his very impugnation, he honoureth our cauſe, and ouerthroweth his owne. Let vs heare his formall argument. *Maior*: Periury, as Ieſuites do confeſſe, is a lye made in an oath: *Minor*: But mentall equiuocating in an oath is periury: *Ergo*, Simply in it ſelfe without an oath it is a ly. Heere a-gaine I would deſire our diſputer to proue his *Minor* propoſition, that euery ſpeach mixt with a mentall reſeruation is periury if it be ſworne: the folly and impiety of which aſſertion is ſufficiently detected before, for that it being a moſt certaine principle, as well in reaſon, as in Deuinity, *that what a man may truly ſay, he may truly alſo ſweare*, And that it is euident, that many ſuch mixt and reſerued propoſitions were vttered by *Chriſt*, and his *Saintes*, as holy Scripture teſtifieth, and we haue giuen many examples in the ninth Chapter going before: as it were impiety to ſay that thoſe propoſitions were lyes out of an oath; ſo were it more impiety to conceaue that they ſhould be periuryes in an oath if they had bene ſworne. And what will *Thomas Morton* now ſay to this? or what ſcrap of proofe can he bring for his *Minor* propoſition, that euery mentall reſerued ſpeach or other equiuocall

Supr. ca. 9.

The confutation of his 4. argumẽt.

propoſition is periury in an oath? He alleadgeth firſt
Exod.20. Ierem.4. thoſe wordes in Exodus; *Thou ſhalt not beare falſe witnes*, expounded by our *Azor* (as he ſaith) that we muſt ſweare in truth, and for the confirmation of truth; but is this any thing againſt vs? And do we not ſay, that all ſuch reſerued propoſitions are true in themſelues in the eares of God, and mynd of the ſpeaker? How impertinent then is this proofe?

18. But hearken further, for he will bring another more ſtrange then this. Your great Moraliſt *Azor* (ſaith he) doth condemne all Equiuocators heerin (to wit for mentall Equiuocation in an oath) as periured lyars, or otherwiſe (ſaith he) there is nothing in an oath that may not be affirmed, and denyed without a lye. Thus he. And I would demaund him about this matter, whether he will ſweare this to be true which he ſaith of *Azor*? For if Miniſters and prieſts go in equall ranke in England, a Miniſters word ought to be equall to an oath, as a prieſts word, laying his hand on his breaſt, is with vs: and then muſt I needes conclude *Tho. Morton* for a periured lyar in deed, who hath ſo perfidiouſly belyed *Azor* in this place, and that in ſo many points. For firſt *Azor* hādling in the booke and Chapter by him cyted, *De iureiurando, cui videtur veritas aliquo modo deeſſe*: Of an oath which may ſeeme in ſome ſorte to want truth, he doth put downe diuers examples (8. or. 9. at leaſt) wherin the ſwearer may ſweare truly in his owne ſenſe, though falſe in the ſenſe of him that exacteth the oath, all which are ſo many plaine approbations of ſwearing Equiuocall propoſitions without periury, and ſo many publicke contradictions and confutations of *Tho. Mortons* notorious ſlaunder auouched heere againſt him, that he condemneth al Equiuocators for liers. Of which caſes heere determined by *Azor* againſt *Morton*, the firſt is, *Si Sacerdos rogetur &c.* If a prieſt be asked any thing which

Pag.60. & 61.

Azor notably belyed by T.Mortō.

lib.11.c.4. §.Quintò quæritur.

he

he hath heard in confeſsion, he may anſwere, *ſe nihil ſcire, nihil audiuiſſe*, that he knoweth nothing, he hath heard nothing. And how then doth this *great Moraliſt condemne all Equiuocators herein as periured lyars?* Is not this publicke lying in *Tho. Morton*, and that in print? And were not this formall periury, if he did ſweare it in any court whatſoeuer? as namely in his Lords Court of the *Arches*? And ſhould he not be puniſhed in that Court as a periured perſon, if it were proued againſt him? And how then dareth he to commit the ſame ſo publickly without bluſhing? But let vs leaue him to his Lords correction in this behalfe, and ſo paſſe on to an other point.

19. Secondly then, not only the ſenſe and drifte but the wordes themſelues ſet downe by T. M. out of *Azor* are moſt fraudulently and falſely alleadged: *Quidam putauit* (ſaith he) *fas eſſe cuiquam, vt vitam ſuam conſeruet, hoſti iurare, tantummodo eo ſenſu, quem mente intus concipit, poſſemus enim hac ratione quiduis negare, & nihil non abſque mendacio dicere.* Some haue thought it lawful (ſaith he) to euery man, for the cõſeruation of his life, to ſweare to his enemy only in that ſenſe, which he conceaueth inwardly in his owne mynd, which if it ſhould be graunted, then might we by this meanes deny any thing, and ſpeake what we will without a lye. *Azor. lib. 11. c. 4. §. Primo quidem.*

20. Theſe are alleadged for *Azor* his wordes, and in deed the moſt of them are in *Azor*, but not togeather as they lye heere, but ſome in one place, and ſome in another, ſpoken to different purpoſes, & in different ſenſe from that T. M. alleadgeth them corruptly in this place. And for proofe heerof, and of the egregious cofenage of this lying Miniſter, it ſhall be ſufficient to let yow know that this ſpeciall example alleadged here as out of *Azor*, and as reiected by him of one that ſware to his enemy, for ſauing his life in another ſenſe then his wordes did ſound, is not reiected but vvilfull and perfidious dealing.

allowed, and approued by *Azor*. For that he hauing proposed the case first, vnder other learned mens names, much after the sense as heere is set downe by *Morton*, he commeth at length to resolue, and approue the same in his owne name saying: *Quare libenter concedimus id quod paulò antè dicebatur de eo, qui vt se saluum tueatur promittit latroni, tyranno aut hosti daturum se illi pecuniæ quantitatem &c.* Wherfore we do willingly grant that, " which before was proposed of him that by oath doth " promise vnto a thefe, a tyrant, or his enemy for sauing " his life, to giue him a certayne quantity of money, " which yet notwithstanding in his mynd he hath no " purpose to do, swearing with this reseruation, *dabo, si debeo*, I wil giue it if I owe it. Now then consider good reader the honesty and truth of *Tho. Morton*, that bringeth in *Azor* to condemne that as lying periury which he doth not only allow, as truth, and no ly, but proueth also the lawfulnes therof by many examples; and especially by this of him that sweareth by Equiuocation, which example *Morton* bringeth in as cõdemned by *Azor*, for periurious lying: what will yow say? or what will you do with such men? And doe yow note also that in the former wordes of *Azor*, he cutteth of *Latroni & Tyranno*, and this to preueut a case resolued against him afterward by *Cicero*, *prædonibus & piratis*, to theeues and pirates periury is not committed; what then (I say) is to be thought, or said, or done with such men? Himselfe setteth downe a rule out of *Tully* in his Epistle to the King, *that such as are taken once in lying may neuer after be credited againe*, which he applyeth against the Catholickes, but how iustly it ought to be practised in him, and his fellowes, that are taken at euery turne in such notorious wilfull lying, is euident to the discreet Reader.

His fifth argument, Truth God, lying the diuell. §. 5.

21. IF a man had time to looſe in diſcuſsing this two-membred argument, it might be ſome recreation to ſee the diſputers folly, & weaknes in that he taketh in hand. For firſt he ſetteth downe the wordes of *S. Paul* vnto the Hebrewes, *That it is impoſsible for God to lye*, which we graunt, as yow know, and haue proued it largely before, and this, *neque de potentia ordinaria neque abſoluta*; & then he inferreth out of that, that it is as vnlawfull for God to Equiuocate, *for that otherwiſe* (ſaith he) the elect of God ſhould not haue any ſtrong conſolation, for that they may ſtill doubt, that God doth Equiuocate with them: and ſo when his ſpirite doth witnes to the ſpirites of his elect, that they are the ſonnes of God, and that they ſhall not periſh; yet might they ſuſpect (ſaith he) that it is ſpoken with ſome ſecret reſerued clauſe of deluſion, which blaſphemy (ſaith he) be farre from the hartes of his regenerate.

Heb. 6.
Supra Cap. 7.
Rom. 8.
Pag. 62.

22. Wherto I anſwere firſt, that hauing ſet downe that which we haue before, about the different nature of falſitie and Equiuocation, euery child will laugh at *Thomas Mortons* inference: *God cannot lye, or vtter a falſe propoſition*, Ergo, *he cannot vtter a doubtfull or Equiuocall propoſition*, that may haue one ſenſe in the hearers vnderſtanding, and another in the ſpeakers, ſuch as that was of Chriſt our Sauiour, when he ſaid, *diſſolue this temple, and I will buyld vp the ſame againe in three dayes*, which the Phariſees, and all other hearers commonly

vnderſtood of the materiall temple, wherin he ſtood, when he ſpake the wordes, but they were deceyued, for himſelfe meant the holy tẽple of his ſacred body, *Ergo*, in this he did Equiuocate according to the definition of Equiuocation now agreed vpon betweene vs: yea *Ariſtotles* definition alſo agreeth to this ſpeach of *Chriſt*, for that the word *temple* heere doth equally ſignify two thinges, and conſequently either *Morton* muſt deny Chriſt to be God, or *affirme* that God can Equiuocate, though he cannot lye. And the many examples which we haue alleadged before in the 9. Chapter, and ſhall do afterward in this, to the next argument, muſt needes put this Miniſter in a ſacke & ſtopp his mouth in this behalfe.

23. His ſecond inference alſo, that if God could Equiuocate, the conſolation of the elect could not be ſtrong, is ydle in like manner. For if God could lye, this inference might haue place, but an Equiuocall propoſition in the ſenſe we talke of, that is to ſay, where ſome parte is vttered, and ſome other reſerued in the mynd, is as true and certaine in the vnderſtanding of the ſpeaker, as any other propoſition is, or can be; and in matters of religion it belongeth to the faith of the hearer ſo to belieue, and to ſeeke out the ſpeakers reſeruation for his better aſſurance, as in the examples before alleadged, when God ſaid by the Prophet, *That whoſoeuer calleth vpon the name of our Lord ſhalbe ſaued*: and the hearer on the other ſide ſeeth all heretickes and Sectaries whatſoeuer to call vpon the ſame name, and yet ſhall not be ſaued; yea he heareth alſo thoſe wordes of Chriſt: *Not euery one that ſaith vnto me Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdome of heauen, &c.* Yet is he bound vnder payn of Infidelity to belieue that the former generall propoſition of *Ioel* the Prophet, which hath a further reſerued mentall meaning then in wordes is vttered, is true and infallible, and conſequently

How reſerued propoſitions are true and certeyn in themſelues.

Ioel. 2.

Matth. 7.

quently he muſt ſeeke out the true reſeruation, or clauſe not expreſſed, whereby the whole propoſition is made true, which otherwiſe, as it lyeth, and ſoundeth, is falſe; for that to ſpeake generally without reſeruation, *That euery one that calleth vpon the name of God, ſhalbe ſaued*, cannot vniuerſally be true, for ſo much as the contrary therof is euident, that many who call vpon that name, are not ſaued but damned. And almoſt infinite other places like to this are foūd in Scripture, as *he that belieueth and is baptized ſhalbe ſaued; he that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my bloud, hath life euerlaſting*; and ſuch other, which cannot be verifyed in the generall ſenſe of the words, without ſome reſeruation not expreſſed.

24. And as for that he would not haue his new elect Proteſtants, to want of their ſtrong conſolation, or to ſtand in doubt of ſome reſeruation (as he ſaith) when Gods ſpirit witneſſeth to their ſpirits, that they are the ſonnes of God, & that they ſhall not periſh (which reſeruation he wickedly calleth *A clauſe of deluſion*) he might more truly terme that their fond preſumption, *deluſion*, wherby they will needs apply vnto themſelues that thing abſolutly, which God ſpeaketh alwayes with due reſeruation, and condition, as now hath byn ſhewed in the examples alleadged, that not euery one abſolutly ſhall be ſaued, that calleth vpon the name of our Lord, or belieueth and is baptized, or eateth his fleſh, and drinketh his bloud; but they only that call vpon his name rightfully, and as they ought to do, and as Chriſt himſelf expoundeth it, to witt they that call vpon him, and ioyntly doe performe the will of his Father in keeping his commandemēts; and the like in thoſe that belieue & are baptized, and liue well, and thoſe that eat his fleſh and drinke his bloud worthily: which conditions and reſeruations muſt neceſſarily be vnderſtood alſo in the ſpeach of

that

Incerteinty of ſaluation not on Gods part but on ours. *Matt vlt. Ioan. Ep. 1. cap. 2. 3, 4.*

that ſpirit that ſpeaketh to proteſtants, if it be from God, as both *S. Iohn* and Chriſt himſelfe expoundeth, and this is not blaſphemy as *Tho. Morton* imagineth, but true humility, for here the doubtfulnes is not of the aſſurance of Gods promiſe, but of our performance, that is to ſay, whether we do performe thoſe neceſſary conditions which alwayes are to be vnderſtood in Gods promiſes towards vs for keeping his commandements. And thus much of the firſt part of his argument apperteyning to God.

His argument drawne from the Deuill.

25. But now for the other parte, concerning the *Dyuell*, it is much more childiſh, for thus he argueth. MAIOR: *That doctrine cannot be true, which ſtopped a mans mouth from geuing the Dyuell the lye.* MINOR: *But if Equiuocation be admitted, all mankind is ſilenced from geuing the dyuell his due tytle of lyer.* ERGO *Equiuocating is no doctrine of truth, &c.* And for proofe of his *Minor*, he alleadgeth only the example of *Eue* in paradiſe, demaunding of vs, whether whē the dyuell ſaid to her: *Though yow eate, yow ſ hall not dye*, ſhe might haue ſaid to him, *thou lyeſt*. For if we deny that ſhe may, then do we tye her tongue from calling the dyuell a lyer, and if we grant that ſhe may ſay ſo, then would the dyuell eſcape by ſaying to her, that he did not lye but only Equiuocate.

Gen. 3.

26. And is not this goodly ſtuffe? fit for a booke? fit for a print? fit for a Chaplyn of my Lord of Canterbury? Are theſe things ſuffred to paſſe without controlment in England? If the dyuell be father of lyes, and conſequently of them that do lye, of what kynred will he proue to be to this Miniſter that hath byn taken now with ſo many notorious witting and wilfull lyes as before hath byn ſhewed? which how they are Equiuocatiõs alſo in a worſer ſenſe ſhall be ſhewed in the chapter following, and conſequently that *T. Morton* is an egregious Equiuocator in that ſorte and kind,

which

which *Sathan* himſelfe did vſe to deceaue our Grandame *Eue.*

His ſixt argument intituled, from examples of diſſimulation condemned by Scriptures, Fathers, Pagans. §. 6.

27. HEERE yow ſee how he tyeth togeather *Scriptures, Fathers,* and *Pagans,* & all do proue indeed his purpoſe alike; for that he bringeth nothing to the purpoſe out of any of them. And firſt yow ſee that he flyeth the word *Equiuocation,* and nameth only *Diſſimulation,* which *Equiuocation* we haue proued lately before to be a different thing from *Diſſimulation,* for that *Equiuocation* hath a true ſenſe and meaning in the mynde of the ſpeaker, conforme to the matter and circumſtance that is handled, and moſt euidently vſed by Chriſt himſelfe and diuers holy men, as largely before hath bene declared, which yet without impiety cannot be called or tearned *Diſſimulation,* in ſuch a ſenſe as *Tho. Morton* would haue it, to wit, as *Diſſimulation* importeth deceipt or fraud, for otherwiſe *S. Auguſtine* himſelfe writing *contra mendacium,* againſt lying, doth confeſſe that in a good ſenſe Chriſt did diſſemble, when he ſaid: *Quis me tetigit,* who touched me, when he knew well ynough who it was; and of *Lazarus, Vbi poſuiſtis eum?* where haue yow buryed him? *Per hoc, neſcire ſe finxit,* ſaith *S. Auguſtine*: Chriſt by this kynde of ſpeech did feigne that he knew not. And againe in the ſame booke, neyther that which *Iacob* did to obtayne the benediction of his Father, nor that which *Ioſeph* did to delude his brethren, nor that which

Supra cap. 8. VVhat diſſimulation is vnlavvfull and vvhat not.

Aug. lib. contra mendacium c. 12. in fine.

Marc. 5. Ioan. 11.

Gen. 27. Gen. 42. 1. Regum 21.

Supra Cap. 7.

Dauid did when he feigned himſelfe to be mad, *Neque cætera huiuſmodi mendacia iudicanda ſunt*, neyther other ſuch like diſsimulations as theſe are, may be iudged for lyes: Before alſo we haue heard his opinion for allowing all diſsimulation in ſtratagems, ſo the war be iuſt. And thus much for the tytle of his argument, now to the ſubſtance.

28. Firſt to begine with his examples out of *Scriptures*, I ſay that he might better haue ſaid *Example* in the ſinguler number: for wheras we of our parte haue alleadged ſo many, and ſo great variety of examples in our former diſcourſe to the contrary, he (poore man) out of all the body of the whole Bible, hath alleadged but one, and that nothing to his purpoſe, as preſently ſhall appeare. His example is out of the Acts of the Apoſtles, where it is recounted how *Ananias* and *Saphira* his wife, hauing ſold a certayne field of theirs, and bringing a parte of the price, and laying it at the feete of the Apoſtle, as though it had bene the whole price, were miraculouſly puniſhed by *Saint Peter* for defrauding the Community of that which they had promiſed, or would pretend to giue; *An Act* (ſaith T. Morton) *proper to the infancy of the Church, to bring their ſubſtance, and tender it to the Apoſtles for the comon good of the Saints.* By which words if he allow that fact, as a forme of perfection in that purity and integrity of the Chriſtian Churches begining, why then now is the imitation therof in religious men of our dayes impugned by the Proteſtants? And if by the word *infancy* he meane weaknes or imperfection in the ſenſe of *S. Paul*, ſaying: *Cùm eſſem paruulus*, &c. *VVhen I was a child or infant, I ſpeake as a child, I vnderſtood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I came to the yeares of a man, I caſt of thoſe thinges that belonged to a child*: If this (I ſay) be *Thomas Mortons* meaning to note the act of imperfection, the ancient * Fathers do ſtand wholy againſt him,

The fact of Ananias and Saphyra diſcuſſed.

Act. 5. Pag. 64.

* *Chryſ. hom. 12. in Acta Apoſtolorũ*

him, and do allow it rather for great perfection, and that it was a vow of voluntary pouerty to liue in comon, which thoſe firſt Chriſtians had made by counſell of the Apoſtles, and conſequently do interprete thoſe wordes, *Nonne manens tibi manebat*, &c. Did it not remayne in your power to giue it, or not to giue it? to haue byn meant by *S. Peter* before their vow, which if it be true and that *S. Peter* did giue ſo dreadfull a ſentence vpon the firſt vow-breakers of voluntary pouerty, euen for deteyning ſomwhat of their owne, how much may *Thomas Morton*, and ſome friends of his feare the like ſentence, for teaching it to be lawfull to take away that from a Religious cõmunity, which themſelues neuer gaue.

Cap. 11. *Hier. epiſt. 8. ad Demet. Auguſt. Ser. 27. de verbis Apoſt. Fulgẽtius epiſt. de debito cõiugali c. 8. Grego lib. 1. epiſt. 33. adi'enant. Oecũ enius Arator, Rabanus, Lyra, & alij in hunc locum.*

29. But let vs come to the application of this example againſt Equiuocation, which he hath choſen to vſe principally about the womans ſpeach. *The woman is asked* (ſaith he:) *Sould yow the land for ſo much? Her anſwere is; yea, for ſo much, meaning but one halfe, & concealing the other, in which diſſimulation it is impoßible, but that your reſerued clauſe muſt haue come into her mynd, to thinke but ſo much to giue in common, or to ſignifye vnto yow.* Thus *Thomas Morton* teacheth that poore woman to equiuocate, after his manner of Equiuocation, that is to ſay, to lye: for that now I ſuppoſe he hath learned, by that which hath byn ſet downe in our precedent Chapter, that to ſpeake an vntruth, or to conceale a truth, or to vſe any Equiuocation when we are iuſtly demaunded by our lawfull Superiour, and when no iniurie, or violence is vſed vnto vs, is a greiuous mortall ſinne in our Catholick Doctrin, and conſequently ſhe being lawfully demaunded by *S. Peter* in a lawfull cauſe, touching her owne vow & promiſe, no clauſe of reſeruation could ſaue her ſpeech from lying, as our Miniſter doth fooliſhly imagine.

Pag. 65.

The vvomans examination by S. Peter.

30. Wherfore *S. Peter* as moſt lawfull Iudge and go-

uernour of the vniuersall Church vnder *Christ*, & the holy Ghost in him, did worthily punish that dissimulation and lying both in her and her husband, for example of others in that beginning, and for manifesting the great and special assistance of the holy Ghost, that assisted him, and should be in his Successors to the worldes end in that their gouernement, to the terror of wicked men that should impugne it, or otherwise deserue by their demerites to be punished by the same. And thus much of his examples out of Scriptures, which is but one as yow see, and that much against himselfe and his owne cause if I be not deceaued, for that it proueth all equiuocation is not lawfull, as he will nedes suppose vs to hold.

31. In the Fathers he is more copious, for he hath two examples, but of as small moment to the purpose as this. The first out of *S. Augustine* in his booke against lying, where he proposeth a certaine Case, that if a sicke Father hauing a sonne vpon the point of death, whom he loueth so tenderly, that if he should know he were dead, it would indanger also his owne life, what might his friend answere vnto him, who comming from his sonne, and knowing him to be dead, should be demaunded by the said Father, whether he were dead or no: *S. Augustines* resolution is, that which before we haue also set downe in our generall Doctrine to be true, that for sauing any mans temporall life, a lye is not to be made: But he will replye perhaps, that *S. Augustine* saith, he could not say, *nescio*, *I know not* whether he be dead, or aliue, which is allowed by vs in some Equiuocations, as in the precedent Chapter hath byn said. But to this I answere, that this case is not like those, for that heere is no iniust demand, no force, no compulsion, no iniurie offred, and consequently no right of vsing such euasion for iust defence, for so much as this is in common con-

Lib. cont. mend. c. 18.

S. Augustines case about the sick man.

Supra, c. 7.

uersation,

uerſation, from which we haue exempted before the vſe of Equiuocations, albeit we haue heard alſo out of the ſame *S. Auguſtine* himſelfe, *Aliud eſt mentiri, aliud veritatem celare.* It is one thing to lye, and another thing to couer a truth without lying. *S. Auguſtine* ſpeaketh againſt the firſt, and ſo do we, and conſequently this example proueth nothing. *Supra c. 7. & 8.*

32. His ſecond is out of the ſame Father in another worke of like argument, where he putteth the example of a certain Biſhop of *Tagaſte* in *Africa*, named *Firmus*, who in time of the Pagan Emperours hauing hidden a man that fledd to his refuge, anſwered the Emperours officers that came to ſeeke him, *nec prodam, nec mentiar*, I will neither bewray him, neither will I make a ly, and ſo was content rather to ſuffer tormentes, then he would do either: for which *S. Auguſtine* greatly commendeth him, and ſo was he worthy, for it was indeed an heroicall act. And if therin he did more reſolutly then he was bound, as many prieſts in England haue done, that preſently vpon their apprehenſion haue confeſſed themſelues to be prieſtes, it inferreth no law, that all men are bound to do the like. For as the lawe it ſelfe ſaith: *Cuique licet de iure ſuo cedere*: It is lawfull for euery man to yeeld of his owne right what he pleaſe, as *S. Paul*, though in one place he ſaith, that it is lawfull for him *that ſerueth the Altar to liue by the Altar*, and that *he which ſoweth ſpirituall thinges, may well reape temporall*: yet of himſelfe he ſaith that he did it not, nor would do it, and that he would rather dye then looſe this glory, to wit, of not hauing vſed his right therin. This was perfection in that glorious Apoſtle, but not obligation: and though it edifye all, yet it byndeth not any to the neceſſarie imitation therof, but he that will; and the like we may ſay of the renowned fact of Biſhop *Firmus*.

The ſecõd caſe of S. Auguſtine about B. Firmus vvhoe vvould neither ly nor betray. *Aug. li. de mend. cap. 13.*

1. Cor. 15.

1. Cor. 9.

His third example of Pagan writers he ſetteth downe in theſe wordes out of Cicero. §. 7.

33. THERE was a man (ſaith he) who togeather with mine other priſoners, being diſmiſſed out of the priſon of *Carthage* vpon his oath, that he within a prefixed time ſhould returne againe: As ſoone as he was out of priſō he returned as though he had forgot ſomthing, and by & by departeth home to *Rome*, where he ſtayed beyond the time appointed, anſwering that he was freed from his oath: but ſee now the opinion of his owne Countryman (*Cicero*) concerning this Equiuocation of returne. This was not well done, ſaith *Tullie*, for that craft in an oath, doth not leſſen, but make the periury more heynous. Wherfore the graue Senators of *Rome* ſent this Coſeming mate backe againe to the priſon of *Hannibal* their enemy, from whome he had eſcaped. *&c.*

Pag. 90.

The caſe ſet dovvn by Cicero of priſoners let forth vpō their oath by Hannibal. *Lib.* 3. *Officio.* §. *Regulus.*

34. Thus relateth *Morton* the caſe, and then maketh this malicious concluſion againſt vs: *This was the honeſtie of the ancient heathenish* Rome, *which muſt ryſe vp in iudgement againſt this preſent* Rome *to condemne it, which hath changed that faithfull Roman faith*, in fidem Punicam, *into Carthaginian faith, which now by cuſtome of ſpeach is taken for perfidiouſnes it ſelfe.* And would not yow thinke that *Morton* did hold himſelfe very free from this perfidiouſnes, that obiecteth the ſame ſo freely againſt vs? And not only againſt vs, but to the whole Church of *Rome* it ſelfe, and to the vniuerſall Catholike Religiō conioyned therwith? Marke then the deportment of this

of this man in this one poynt, and if yow knew him not before learne to know him by this.

35. Firſt then I would haue ſome Grammer-ſcholler that ſtudyeth *Tullies Offices*, to turne to the places heere quoted, and comparing them with that which this Miniſter ſetteth downe in Engliſh, conſider how they hange togeather, and how he picketh out one ſentence in one place, & another in another, & leapeth forth and backe to make ſome coherence of ſpeach, contrary to the Authors order, ſenſe, and method, as is ridiculous to behold, and fit for the *Coſening mate* of whom he talketh in his text. And ſecondly after this, is to be noted, that he ſetteth downe the narration it ſelfe of ten men deliuered vpon their oath by *Hannibal*, not as *Cicero* doth out of two hiſtoriographers *Polybius* and *Accilius*, and in particuler againſt the faith of both their hiſtories, and *Tullies* aſſeueration, which ſaith that thoſe ten were diſmiſſed by *Hannibal* out of his campe, *poſt Cannenſem pugnam*, after the famous battle of *Canna* in *Apulia*, *Morton* ignorantly ſaith they were diſmiſſed *out of the priſon of Carthage*, wheras they of all liklihood had neuer ſeene *Carthage* in their lyues.

Cic. lib. 3. offic. §. Regulus & §. ſed ſi.

36. But the moſt notorious Coſenage is, that he peruerteth all *Cicero* his meaning, wordes, ſenſe, and diſcourſe in this matter, alleadging them quite contrary to himſelfe, as before yow haue heard him do many other Authors, ſo as he belyeth and corrupteth them all, both prophane and dyuine: And if in this one poynt he can deliuer himſelfe from *Punica fides*, I will ſay he playeth the man indeed. For firſt *Cicero* whom heere he would ſeeme to bring againſt vs, doth fully agree with vs, for that we ſay in the caſe of thoſe ten *Romanes* deliuered by *Hannibal* vpon their oath to returne againe, if they ſhould not obteyne that which they were ſent for, (which was to perſuade the *Senate*

T. M. much preſſed vvith Punica fides, about falſification.

to

to redeeme diuers thouſands of other Roman ſoul-diers whom *Hannibal* had taken in the ſaid victory at *Canna*) we hold I ſay firſt that if they ſwore abſolutely to returne againe if they obteyned not their ſute they were bound truly to performe the ſame, and ſecond-ly, that they being now iuſtly by law of armes pri-ſoners of *Hannibal*, they were bound to ſweare ſince-rely to his intention, and not to any other reſerued meaning of their owne as in the former chapter hath byn declared. And this very ſame doctryne alſo tea-cheth *Cicero* by light of nature in theſe wordes perfi-diouſly cut of, and left out by this Miniſter *Morton* in the very ſame place, out of which he taketh the reſt.

37. *Eſt autem* (ſaith he) *ius etiam bellicum fideſq́, iuriſu-randi ſæpe hoſti ſeruanda, quod enim ita iuratum eſt, vt mens conciperet fieri oportere, id ſeruandum eſt: quod aliter, id ſi non feceris, nullum periurium eſt.* There is alſo a law of armes (ſaith he) and a faith in our ſwearing to be obſerued oftentymes, euen vnto our enemy, for that which is ſo ſworne by vs, as our mynd doth conceaue that it muſt be donne, that is to be obſerued: but if it be otherwiſe ſworne, that is no periury, if he performe it not. Behold heere the very ſame diſtinction which Catholicke Deuines put downe of ſwearing accor-ding to the intention, and vnderſtanding of the ſwea-rer, or of him to whom it is ſworne, and that the for-mer is that byndeth, and maketh periury, if it be not performed, and not alwayes the ſecond, to wit, when any violence or force is vſed, which *Cicero* doth ex-preſſe in the very next immediate wordes by the ſelfe ſame example that *Azor* vſed before: *Si prædonibus pa-ctum pro capite pretium non attuleris, nulla fraus eſt, ne ſi iuratus quidem id non feceris, &c. non enim falſum iurare peierare eſt: ſed ſi ex animi tui ſententia iurauerus ſicut verbis concipitur more noſtro, id non facere periurium eſt. Scitè enim Euripides:*

Iuraui lingua, mentem iniuratam gero.

Cicero moſt plaine againſt T. M. and for Catho like Do-ctrine.

If yow

If yow ſhould not pay the price or ranſome vnto publicke theeues, which was agreed betweene yow for ſauing of your life, it is no deceipt, no though yow had ſworne to performe it, for that periury is not to ſweare falſe in any ſorte: But if yow ſweare a thing which yow determine in your mynd, and do vtter it in wordes according to the cõmon cuſtome of ſpeach and do not performe it, this is periurie. For well and fitly to the purpoſe ſaith the Poet *Euripides*, I haue ſworne with my tongue, but my mynd hath not ſworne. So he.

38. And conſider now heere (I pray yow) the *Punica fides* of our Miniſter againſt our Romane faith. He ſaith that *Cicero*, and other heatheniſh *Romanes* ſhall ryſe vp againſt vs at the day of Iudgement, for that they condemne all reſeruation or doubtfull ſenſe in an Oath, and do condemne it for periury: wheras *Cicero* affirmeth that there is neither periury, nor fraud therin. And the ſame Philoſopher alloweth the very ſame example of ſwearing with a reſerued intention to a publicke theefe, without either meaning or obligation to performe it, which *Morton* obiecteth to *Azor* in the precedẽt Chapter (though craftily, leauing out the words *Latroni & Tyranno*, for auoyding the force of this place, as before is noted) ſaying, *that* Azor *did condemne for lying all ſuch Equiuocation againſt his ſubtile brethren*, wheras he both affirmeth and proueth the ſame, no leſſe then *Cicero* doth heere in this place, as before hath byn ſhewed. Who then ſhall ryſe in Iudgment againſt *Thomas Morton*, for all this wilfull lying? No doubt but *Sathan* himſelfe, that is the Father of lyers in this life, and ſhall be their tormentor in the next. And ſo much about his ſixt argument.

T Morton conuinced of egregious coſenage.

His ſeauenth argument taken from a ſigne, an interpreter, a coyne, and Gigesring. §. 8.

39. AT this argument I preſume yow laugh before yow beginne to read it, ſeing it is only of cõpariſons, and ſimilitudes: yet doth he enter into the
Pag. 82. ſame with this inſulting preface. *Now* (ſaith he) *that we haue wreſted your weapons out of your handes it will be eaſie to pearce yow, euen with ſimilitudes, the blunteſt kind of argumentes.* And then he beginneth to lay about him with theſe blunt weapons, ſaying out of his firſt compariſon or ſimilitude of ſignes: That where as voyces and
» writinges are by our confeſsion ſignes, and inſtru-
» mentes to expreſſe a propoſition, and that euery ſigne
» which is contrary to the ſignification is a lying ſigne,
» as an Iuy-buſh at a Bakers dore is a lying ſigne, ydols
» in viſible formes are lying vanityes, miracles not pro-
» ceeding from omnipotent power aboue nature, are
» lying wonders, the action of the ſtage-player lifting
» vp his hand to heauen, and looking downe with cry-
» ing *O earth*, is a lying geſture: ſo is the voyce of a prieſt,
» that ſaith, *I am no prieſt*, a lying voyce, and the penne
The firſt ſigne turned againſt himſelfe. that defendeth this doctrine, a lying pen. This is all the force of this argument, which prouing nothing as yow ſee in it ſelfe, may be iuſtly reiected, & anſwered with this other compariſon not in ſimilitude only, but ſubſtance of truth, that for a Miniſter to be taken in ſo many apparãt lyes, as before hath byn ſet downe muſt needs be no lying, but a true ſigne of a falſe & lying ſpirite in that kinde of men. And ſo much for this.

40. His

40. His ſecond, third and fourth ſimilitudes are yet more blunt. For in the ſcoend he ſaith: That as if the *Pope* ſhould ſend his *Nuntio* with an Interpreter to congratulate our King, wiſhing him all health, & reſeruing in his mynd, *admodũ exiguam* very ſmall health: and in the the third; That as clypping and impayring the kynges coyne is high treaſon: ſo Equiuocators by clypping of ſome wordes of their ſpeach, which is the Image of God, are guylty of higher then higheſt treaſon. And in the fourth, that as *Giges-ring* when the pale was kept on the backe ſyde of his hand he was viſible, but being turned to the palme of his hand, he was inuiſible: ſo (ſaith he) our Equiuocator, when he ſhall happely turne his equiuocating clauſe outward to manifeſt it in ſpeach, he lyeth openly and is eaſely knowne for a diſloyall ſubiect: but when he keepeth it cloſe in his mynd he is emboldened to practice againſt his King. So he.

Three vayne ſignes taken for argumentes by T. M.

41. And I thinke euery man would condemne me of folly, if I ſhould go about to ſpẽd tyme or more words in confuting ſo vaine, and ydle conceipts, caſt out only to entertayne the Reader for lacke of better matter, without ground or proofe. Wherfore leauing to treat of theſe *his blunt weapons* any further, and of this firſt concluſion, which yow ſee how bluntly he hath proued, or rather improued againſt himſelfe; we ſhall paſſe to his ſecond concluſion, which yet is more improbable, and abſurd then the firſt, as by treating therof wil manifeſtly appeare.

Of his ſecond concluſion and proofes therof. §. 9.

42. HAVING byn longer about this firſt concluſion of T. M. then was intended at the begining, we ſhall now endeauour to be much breifer about the ſecond. *Our ſecond concluſion* (ſaith he) *is, that no manner of Equiuocation, whether mentall or verball, can be vſed in an oath without ſacrilegious prophanation*: and then preſently, as it were, forgetting himſelfe what he had ſaid, he beginneth his Treatiſe with this playne contradiction to his owne concluſion: We deny not (ſaith he) but ambiguous wordes may ſomtymes be vſed in common ſpeach, for ſo we read of *Athanaſius*, who flying by ſhip the malice of the perſecutor, and being ouertaken was asked, *did not Athanaſius paſſe this way?* who anſwered, *yea, he is a little before, if yow make haſt yow may ouertake him*, whervpon the perſecutor imagining that *a little before* muſt ſignify ſome other ſhip that went before, paſſed by and purſued a butterfly.

Pag. 85.

Socrates, Sozomen, & alij.

43. This is his narration, and the ſilly diſputer (for in that name he ſeemeth to delight) hath not the diſcretion to ſee that this example ouerthroweth fully his former propoſition. For if it were lawfull for *Saint Athanaſius* to vſe this Equiuocation in ſpeach and fact for deluding his perſecutors; then had it bene lawfull alſo to ſweare the ſame without ſacrilegious prophanation, if they had vrged him vnto it. For as all Deuines hold, that which may lawfully be ſaid may alſo lawfully be ſworne, what will T. M. anſwere to this? what will he anſwere to that euaſion of *S. Paul* mentioned by vs before, when for eſcaping the hands of the Iewes, that purſued him in iudgement, he vſed

an

an apparent equiuocall ſpeach, ſaying; *That his trouble was about the hope and reſurrection of the dead.* Paul knowing (ſaith the text) that one parte of them that purſued him were of the *Saduces*, that denyed the reſurrection of the dead, and the other of *Phariſes* that held the contrary, he cryed out in the iudgement-place, ſaying: *De ſpe & reſurrectione mortuorum ego iudicor*, I am called to iudgement about the hope and reſurrection of the dead, which was true in one ſenſe, but falſe in another; wherby the *Phariſes* being deceyued, tooke his parte, *Et facta eſt contentio* (ſayth the text) *inter Phariſæos & Saducæos, & ſoluta eſt multitudo*, and vpon this equiuocall ſpeach there aroſe a diſſention betwene the Phariſes and Saduces, one interpreting it in one ſenſe, and another in another, and ſo the people departing the iudgement brake vp. And what will *Thomas Morton* now anſwere to this? did *S. Paul* lye in this *Equiuocation*? or was his diſsimulation impious, for that one part was deceaued? or had he committed ſacrilegious prophanation if he had ſworne it? I demaund him alſo of that equiuocall oath of the *Patriarch Ioſeph*, who in one conference with his brethren, did twice ſweare vnto them with Equiuocation, that is to ſay, with a reſerued ſenſe different from that he vttered to them in wordes, the Scripture ſaying: *VVhen his brethren had adored him, & he knowing them to be his brethren, ſpake sharpely vnto them as to ſtrangers, ſaying, yow are ſpyes ſent to diſcouer the ſtrength of this land, I ſweare by the health of King Pharao, yow ſhall not go hence, &c.* And againe: *Per ſalutem Pharaonis, &c.* I ſweare by the health of *Pharao* that yow are ſpyes, when notwithſtanding he knew them not to be ſpyes, & ſo thought of them in his mynd. And will T. M. ſay, that this was a lye or at leaſt a ſacrilegious prophanation of an oath? But I muſt go yet a little further in proſecution of this folly againſt the Miniſter.

Act. 23.

Gen. 42.

T. M. vrged to anſwer to an equiuocation vſed in an oath.

44. What then will he ſay to all thoſe former examples of Equiuocall propoſitions, which I haue alleaged out of holy Scripture, out of the new Teſtamént, and from the mouth of our Sauiour himſelfe, eſpecially ſuch as haue verball equiuocation in them:

Ioan. 2. As, *Diſſolue this temple, and I will build it vp againe in three dayes*, where the word *temple*, hath euidently two ſignifications, and was taken in the one by Chriſt our Sauiour, & in the other by the Iewes. And the other,

Ioan. 11. Marc. 5. *Our freind Lazarus ſleepeth* And againe, *The maid is not deed, but ſleepeth*; where the word *ſleepeth* is equiuocall, and hath two ſignifications, the one of death, the other of naturall ſleepe, and Chriſt vnderſtood it in

Ioan. 8. the one, and his hearers in the other. And ſo the like where Chriſt ſaid vnto the Iewes: *Abraham vidit diem meum, & gauiſus eſt*: Abraham did ſee my day, and did reioyce, the word *ſee* is equiuocall, and ſignifieth eyther ſeing in fleſh, or ſeing in ſpirite, and the Iewes being deceyued with the equiuocation of the word, vnderſtood it in one ſenſe, and Chriſt in another, wherupon they ſaid vnto him: *Thou haſt not yet fifty yeares of age, and haſt thou ſeene Abraham?* And therupon tooke ſtones to caſt at him.

Ioan. 4. 45. And the very like example is of our Sauiours ſpeach vnto the *Samaritan* at *Iacobs* well, by the Citty of *Sychar*. *If thow knewſt the gyfte of God, and who it is that ſaith to thee*, Giue me water, *thou wouldeſt aske of him, and he would giue thee liuing water*, where the word *water* being equiuocall, ſignifieth both the element of water, and heauenly grace, which is the water of lyfe euerlaſting: which Equiuocation the woman not vnderſtanding, tooke it in the common ſenſe of naturall water, and asked him how he could giue her *water*, for ſo much as he had no bucket to draw it vp in: but Chriſt our Sauiour addeth an other equiuocall ſpeach to her, ſaying, *That he which ſhall drinke of the water,*

Sundry examples of ſcripture that allow as well verball as mentall equiuocation.

water, which I will giue him, ſhall neuer thirſt more, where not only the word *water*, but the word *thirſt* alſo is equiuocall, & hath two different ſenſes, wherby the woman deceaued, ſaid, *Giue me* (I pray) *of this water that I may thirſt no more, nor come hither to draw*, vnderſtanding ſtill of materiall water.

46. Now I would demaund, that for ſo much as all theſe ſpeaches were manifeſtly equiuocall, and had double ſenſes, and ſignifications, and that in ech one of them the hearers were deceaued, conceauing another ſenſe then that which Chriſt mentally reſerued to himſelfe, I would demaund (I ſay) whether notwithſtanding this, they were not true of themſelues, and whether Chriſt might not as well ſweare them as ſpeake them. And if *Thomas Morton* will haue many examples togeather, wherin Chriſt our Sauiour after his manner of ſwearing (which is *Amen amen dico vobis*) doth ſweare or auouch by oath, ſundry equiuocall propoſitions; let him looke vpon the later parte of the ſixt Chapter of *S. Iohn*; where *Chriſt* doth put the *Antitheſis* betwene himſelfe and *Moyſes*, and betwene the bread that *Moyſes* gaue from heauen, & that which he was to giue, being his owne fleſh, and betwene the lyfe that *Manna* gaue, and that which his fleſh was to giue, and he ſhall fynd many equiuocall propoſitions, both verball, and mentall, auouched by our Sauiour vnder this kind of oath, repeated at leaſt three or foure tymes in that matter. One example of ech kynd ſhall ſuffice.

47. When he ſaith *Amen amen dico vobis, qui credit in me habet vitam æternam*, Truly, truly, I ſay vnto yow, that he who beleeueth in me hath lyfe euerlaſting, this is a mentall reſerued propoſition, as before hath byn ſhewed, for that it is not true generally that euery one that beleeueth in Chriſt hath lyfe euerlaſting, but he that beleeueth accordingly, which was reſerued in

Chriſts

Examples of equiuocationſvvorne by our Sauiour.

Chriſts mynd; and then the wordes immediatly following, *Ego ſum panis vitæ*, I am the bread of lyfe, haue a verball equiuocation, ſignifying of bread that gaue tẽporall lyfe or ſpirituall lyfe, as alſo the other words that enſue: *Your Fathers did eate manna in the deſerte and are dead, but he that ſhall eate of this bread, ſhall not dye. Dying* heere ſignifyeth eyther the death of the body, or the death of the ſoule, and Chriſt meant of the later and the Iewes of the firſt. Nay which is more to be obſerued, as *Euthymius* noteth and ſome other, Chriſt himſelfe without explicating his owne meaning, in one parte of the ſentence, meant of the one ſorte of death, and in the other parte, of the other. For where he ſaith, *Your Fathers in the deſert did eate Manna and are dead*, he meaneth there of the temporall death of the body, and in the other clauſe of the Antitheſis, *But he that ſhall eate of this bread ſhall not dye*, he meant of the eternall death of the ſoule, though others alſo referre it to the eternall lyfe of the body, after reſurrection.

Matth. 8.

48. In like manner that ſentence of our Sauiour to the yonge man in *S. Matthwes* Ghoſpell; *Dimitte mortuos ſepelire mortuos*, Suffer the dead to bury the dead, hath a playne equiuocation; Chriſt vnderſtanding in the former thoſe that were dead in ſpirite, and in the ſecond dead in body, and yet was this no Coſenage nor deceipt in our Sauiour, nor had it beene *ſacrilegious impiety* to ſweare it. All which being ſo, & we hauing *tantam nubem teſtium*, as *S. Paul* ſaith, ſo great a cloud of witneſſes, and theſe *omni exceptione maiores*, without exception for their credit, and the abſurdity and folly of this ſecond propoſition appearing ſo manifeſt in it ſelfe, as it doth: what ſhould we ſtand to examine the arguments and reaſons that may be brought for it by ſo fond a diſputer, as now *Tho. Morton* is proued to be? For ſo much as no reaſon can ſerue for vpholding a paradox ſo ridiculous as this is, euen to com-

to common ſenſe. And yet for that he putteth downe foure arguments, or reaſons for the ſame as before hath byn layd, let vs ſee breifly what they are.

49. His firſt argument for this concluſion is drawne from the forme of an oath, ſet downe by vs before, and heere againe alleadged by him out of *Tolet* and other Authors of ours (for of his owne he ſeemeth to haue none:) *That an oath is a religious inuocation of God, eyther expreſly, or by implication for witnes of our ſpeach*, and the wordes *explicitè* or *implicitè* are added, for that when we ſweare by creatures we ſweare by them in reſpect of the truth of God that is in them, and ſo by God himſelfe *implicitè*. *Tolet lib. 4. Inſtruc. cap. 20.*

50. Now then out of this principle T. M. taketh vpon him to proue this propoſition; *That whenſoeuer, or to whomſoeuer we ſweare, we are bound in conſcience to anſwere directly*, that is to ſay, to ſweare to his intention, to whome we ſweare, which we haue proued before by generall conſent of Deuines & lawyers to be falſe, and *Cicero* himſelfe hath ſo determined the caſe in like manner, as yow haue heard, when a man ſhould be compelled to ſweare to theeues: but yet let vs heare how *Tho. Morton* will proue this his new and ſtrange Deuinity. His ſyllogiſme is this in his owne wordes. A falſe principle and generall propoſition.

> *The competency of God* (ſaith he) *by whome we ſweare, maketh euery one competent Iudges, and hearers to whome we ſweare.*
> *But by ſwearing by God whome we cannot deceaue, we Religiouſly proteſt that in ſwearing we intend not to deceaue.*
> Ergo, *Our deceipfull Equiuocating is a prophanation of the Religious worshippe of God.*

Pag. 86. The abſurd ſyllogiſme of T. M. neither true in forme nor matter.

51. This ſyllogiſme I leaue to be diſcuſſed by Cambridge Logitians, where I heare ſay the man learned

his logicke (if he haue any) for heere he ſheweth very little or none at all, no boy being among vs of foure monethes ſtanding in Logicke or Sophiſtry which will not hiſſe at this argument, both for forme and matter. For as for forme, it is toto ridiculous, the ſyllogiſme hauing no *medium terminum*, at all, nor the cõcluſion any coherence with the premiſſes nor with his chiefeſt purpoſe that he would proue: nay, which is moſt abſurde, wheras according to *Ariſtotle* (whome as yow haue heard T. M. tearmeth *the Oracle of Logitians*) a good Syllogiſme hath only three *terminos*, wherof the one is called *Maior extremus*, the other *Minor extremus*, and the third *Medius terminus*; this ſyllogiſme of his hath ſix *terminos*, and wheras the *Medius terminus* ſhould be repeated in the *Maior* and *Minor* propoſitions, & the concluſion ſhould conſiſt only of the extremes, as if a man ſhould ſay:

Ariſt. lib. 1. Prior. Reſolut. cap. 1.

Euery man is a liuing Creature:
Peter *is a man;*
Ergo, *Peter is a liuing Creature.*

Heere the word *man* is *medius terminus*, and ſo repeated in the *Maior* and *Minor* propoſition; *Peter*, and *lyuing creature* are the two extremes, wherof is framed the third propoſition or concluſion by connexion of the ſaid extreemes by vertue of the *medius terminus* that hath part in them both.

52. But now *Thomas Mortons* ſyllogiſme hath no ſuch *medius terminus*, nor any ſuch connexion of his propoſitions togeather, but euery one of them hath his extremes, to wit, his *ſubiectum* and *prædicatum* ſeparatly, not one depending of the other, and conſequently it is no ſyllogiſme or argument at all, concluding any thing in forme, no more then this ſyllogiſme.

The faultes of Tho. Mortons ſyllogiſme

Euery

Euery man is a liuing Creature:
Euery oxe is a four-footed beaſt;
Ergo, *Euery Aſſe hath two long eares.*

Where yow ſee that there be ſix *termini*, as in *Tho. Mortons* ſillogiſme, without connexion, or dependance one of the other. And as much concludeth this as that. And now compare this his skill (I pray yow) with that bragg of his in the beginning of this his Treatiſe againſt Equiuocation, when he ſaid to his aduerſary: *Dare yow appeale to Logicke? This is the art of artes, and the high tribunall of reaſon and truth it ſelfe, which no man in any matter, whether it be caſe of humanity, or Deuinity, can iuſtly refuſe,* who would not thinke but that the man were very skilfull in that art, wherin he preſumeth to giue ſuch a Cenſure? Pag. 53.

53. But now let vs helpe him out to make his foreſaid ſyllogiſme in forme. It ſhould haue gone thus, if he would haue ſaid any thing in true forme.

The competency of God by whome we ſweare maketh euery one competent Iudges to whom we ſweare:
But in euery oath we ſweare by God, either expreſly or implicatiuely:
Ergo in euery Oath they are competent Iudges to whom we ſweare.

The ſyllogiſme of T. M. brought into forme

And then by an other inference againe he might haue argued, that vnto euery competent and lawfull Iudge we haue confeſſed before, that a man is bound to anſwere directly, and to ſweare to his intention, and not only to his owne, *Ergo*, in no oath to whomſoeuer, may a man Equiuocate, which is his principall propoſition. And thus had his forme of reaſoning byn good, according to the rules of Logicke, though

in matter it had byn false, as now also it is. For that his first *Maior* proposition can neuer be proued, to wit, *That the competency of God by whom we sweare maketh euery one competent Iudges to whom we sweare*, that is to say, for so much as God by whom we sweare is competent Iudge of all, this maketh euery one to whome we sweare by God, to be our competent and lawfull Iudge, which is most absurd, euen in common sense. For that a man may sweare (for exãple) to a theefe or murderer by God, for sauing of his life, as also to a cõmon queane, yea, and to the dyuell himselfe, and yet this maketh not the murderer, the queane, or the diuell to be his competent, and lawfull Iudge, or giueth lawfull iurisdiction, so as he is bound to answere directly to whatsoeuer they demand, or sweare to their intention if he should be compelled by them. And the like in other such examples wherof euery man may frame infinte store vnto himself, at his pleasure: and the reason of this is, that albeit in euery oath God be lawfull and supreame Iudge, to discerne whether I haue a true meaning of mine Oath in my mynd: yet this doth not make the other to whome I sweare my lawfull Iudge, except otherwise he hath iurisdiction ouer me, for that this absurdity, among infinite others would follow, that if a King should sweare to his Kitchin-boy by God, he should therby make his said Kitchin-boy his lawfull and competent Iudge, and to haue Iurisdiction ouer him, both to examine and cõmaund him, and bynd him in conscience vnder sinne to answere him directly: which how great a folly and absurdity it is, ech man that hath reason will easily of himself consider. Wherfore hauing shewed this, let vs now heare and comtemplate (if yow please) how *The. Mor.* himself will proue his said *Maior* proposition, for it is like he will doe it substantially, it being the foundation of all his whole drifte.

54. The *Maior* (saith he) is true, for that our Sauiour „
in auouching truth, held *Pilate* a competent Iudge, „
though he did not proceed *iuridicè*, but falsely. *S. Paul* „
in his cause appealed to *Cesars* tribunall-seate, who „
was a Pagan. *Iacob* did couenant with *Laban* an *Idola-* „
tour: and the maid to whom *S. Peter* swore, was com- „
petent inough to heare a true oath, if he had bene as „
ready to sweare truly: and yet neyther the mayd, nor „
that Iudge did proceed *iuridicè*, for she was no lawfull „
examiner, and he was a partiall Iudge. So he. And this is his wise discourse, wherin the man descryeth himselfe fully what is in him, and that in truth, he doth not vnderstand the very termes in the subiect, whereof he treateth. For we meane by a competent Iudge, or hearer, and so do all Deuynes and Lawyers, that vnderstand what they speake, a Iudge that hath lawfull iurisdiction ouer him that sweareth, & may compell him to sweare, and to vtter the truth sincerely vnder mortall synne. And when we say, that he must proceed *iuridicè*, it is vnderstood, that he must proceed according to forme of law, prescribed by Ecclesiasticall Canons or Ciuill Decrees. Now then according to this explication, to say that *Pilate* was lawfull Iudge vpon *Christ*, so as he was bound in conscience to answere all his demaunds, I maruaile how *Thomas Morton* will proue it: and yet were it nothing to the purpose, for that *Christ* is not read to haue sworne to *Pilate*. And as for *S. Paules* appealing to *Cesar*, which at that tyme was *Nero*, & *Iacobs* couenant with *Laban* an Idolatour, what doth it make to our purpose, for that heere is no swearing mentioned, nor do we deny, but that an Infidell, or Pagan may be a lawfull Iudge ouer faithfull people in secular causes, if otherwise they haue lawfull temporall iurisdiction.

VVho is a lavvfull Iudge or hearer with authority.

55. But of all other iestes, is most pleasant his conceipt of the Maid, to whom *S. Peter* swore, or rather

forſwore his maiſter, *that ſhe was his competent Iudge, or hearer therin, if he had byn ready to ſweare truly*, though preſently he contradicteth himſelfe ſaying, that ſhe was no lawful examiner, which is falſe, if ſhe were a competent hearer or Iudge, which he ſeemeth to graunt, though he ſay ſhe proceeded not *iuridicè*, that is according to forme of law, with *S. Peter* in his examination; wherof enſueth that ſhe had lawfull iuriſdiction ouer him, though the execution therof were not iuridicall: & can any thing be more ridiculous then this?

56. And yet all this notwithſtanding hauing ſet downe ſo vaine and childiſh a diſcourſe as this is, he aſſumeth vnto himſelfe the perſon of a very graue wiſe man againſt vs, vſing theſe cõtemptuous words in the next paragraph enſuing: *Theſe our Equiuocators* (ſaith he) *do by their new ſubtilityes foolefy the honeſt ſimplicity of their ancient Schoole, the two eyes wherof* Lombard *and* Aquinas *ſaw cleerly in this kind of ſwearing an horrible prophanation of the ſacred name of Almighty God.* Heere yow heare him talke of *foolefying*, let vs ſee then his wiſedome. Firſt I aske him wherin we *foolefy the ſimplicity of our ancient Schoole.* He alleadgeth ſome ſentences out of *Peter Lombard*, as alſo out of ſome others, to ſhew that fraud and deceipt is not to be vſed in an oath, as alſo out of *S. Iſidore*, alleadged by *Lombard*, and the like out of *S. Hierome* to ſhew that fraud, deceipt or ſubtility is not to be vſed in ſwearing, which is plainly to be vnderſtood when the Iudge is competent, and proceedeth competently, for vnto a theefe, murderer, pyrate, or tyrant yow haue heard before how *Cicero* hath determined that it is not *fraus*; and in this very place of *S. Thomas* by *Thomas Morton* alleadged, the ſaid Doctors wordes are: That if a Iudge, though otherwiſe lawfull, ſhould require any thing which by order of law he cannot, the party accuſed is not bound to anſwere at all (and much leſſe directly to his meaning)

Pag 87.

Lomb. 3. d. 39. lit. K
D. Th. 2. 2. q. 69. ar. 1.

Iſidor. 2. de ſummo bono. c. 13.
Hier. in. 7. Ezech.

S. Tho. alleaged by Tho. M. againſt himſelfe.

„
„

meaning) but may either by appeale, or other meanes, deliuer himſelfe by euaſiõ, though he may not ſpeake a lye. So *S. Thomas*. And what wyſe man doth not ſee, but that this maketh quite againſt *Thomas Morton*. Firſt if it be lawfull vnto the defendant not to anſwere at all, euen to a competent and lawfull Iudge, when he proceedeth not according to forme of law, then much leſſe is he bound to anſwere or ſweare directly to his intention in that caſe, but may vſe any lawful euaſion by doubtfull ſpeach or otherwiſe, which is directly againſt our aduerſaryes concluſion, ſo little doth he diſcerne when he alleadgeth authorityes flatly againſt himſelfe.

57. And now by the full diſcuſsion of this firſt proofe of his cõcluſion, we may imagin what might be ſaid, if with like diligence we would examine the other three that remayne, to wit from the end of an oath, *à maiori, & à paribus*, for as for the end of an oath, which is to put an end to contention, it is not hindred by the vſe of Equiuocation, where law permitteth the ſame, and I do not doubt but that *T. Morton* hath egregiouſly abuſed both in this and other places, the Catholicke manuſcript Treatiſe againſt which he writeth, by ſetting downe certayne palpable abſurdityes, which is impoſsible to be there in the manner that he ſetteth them downe. And for that I fynd him to belye all kind of Authors commonly, which he cyteth, I muſt preſume the ſame of this vntill we fynd the contrary by viewing the Treatiſe it ſelfe which I ſhortly hope for.

To his other 3. arguments for his ſecond concluſion.

58. But now to his third argument *à minore: That Ieſuiticall Equiuocating is leſſe honeſt then the doctrine of Infidels and Pagans*, procedeth of leſſe wit, I ſuppoſe, then malice, ſeing that for proofe therof he cyteth only this ſentence of *Emanuel Sà* the Ieſuite: *Iurans redire in carcerem, &c.* He that ſweareth to returne into his prſon

Pag. 59.

Eman. Sà in Aphor. tit. Iuramentum.

„ son (except he were iniustly deteyned) is bound euen
„ with the perill of his lyfe to returne to the same pri-
„ son, yea, and some are of opinion that albeit he were
„ iniustly impriſoned, yet ought he to returne, except
„ his oath were releaſed by the Biſhop. Marke this au-
„ thority, whether it do proue the doctrine of Ieſuites to be worſe then that of Infidels and Pagãs: the miniſters malice in cyting this determination of *Emanuel Sà* Ieſuite alludeth to the place of *Cicero* before mentioned, and is alleadged by him immediatly after in this place: but yow haue heard that *Cicero* is quite againſt him, and fully maketh with vs, firſt that a man being iuſtly deteyned in priſon, as thoſe ten *Romanes* are preſumed to haue bene that were let forth vpon their oath by *Hannibal* (to returne if they could not effectuate their buſines) is bound in conſcience to returne againe, which is the firſt parte of this ſpeach of *Emanuel Sà*.

Cic. 3. Ofs fic. vt ſup.

59. Secondly, that if he be iniuſtly deteyned, & made priſoner as by theeues, pyrates, tyrants, or the like, *Cicero* ſaith, he is not bound to returne, albeit he had ſworne it. *Sà* the Ieſuite ſaith, that ſome are of opinion, that he ought notwithſtanding to returne, except his oath be diſpenſed by the Biſhop. Heere then we agree fully with *Cicero* the pagã, adding alſo ſome further reſtraint as yow ſee, and how then is *Morton* ſo ſhameles as to ſay and put in print vpon this authority of *Sà*, that *Ieſuiticall doctrine in this matter, is leſſe honeſt then the doctrine of Infidels or Pagans*? Is this honeſty in a Miniſter? but eſpecially in him, that profeſſeth himſelfe *a Miniſter of ſimple truth*? but ſuch is his truth, and ſuch is his ſimplicity, as in his Miniſtry. Let vs draw to an end.

To his laſt argument.

60. His laſt argument *à paribus* wherby he compareth vs to the heretike *Arius*, and vnto his diſsimulation in Religion, may better fall vpon himſelfe and his fellowes

lowes who more neerly do follow the spirite and steppes of that and other ancient heretickes, and principally in this one point of varying one from an other and among themselues, and changing their opinions so often and frequently, as that which is noted by *Tertullian* in the heresies of his dayes, *That euery yeare brought forth a newe faith.* And this may be seene in the number of sects, that haue risen in this age from *Luther* downward, which are come to be so many in effect, as scarcely they can be numbred, and a hard matter it is to bring them to any certainty of sentence, when they are pressed, but do dissemble, Equiuocate, and ly with such facility, as scarsely any thing can be proued against them, wherof among many others before mentioned, we haue had a good example of *Tho. Morton* himselfe in this and the precedent Chapters, and shall haue of some more of his fellowes in the next.

Tertul. li. de præsc. cont. hæreses.

61. And yet as though he were a great, and sincere louer of truth, he entitleth the last paragraph of his Treatise thus: *This our Apostolicall defence of Protestantes I will cõclude with the protestations of the Apostle,* I say *the truth, & lye not; my conscience bearing me witnesse &c.* And againe: *God the Father of our Lord Iesus Christ knoweth that I lye not.* And yet further to his scholler *Timothy: I speake the truth and ly not.* And finally to the *Galathians*; *This that I write vnto yow, behold I witnes before God, and ly not.*

Thomas Mortons conclusion and Apostolicall defence by protestations against lying. Rom. 9. 2. Cor. 11. 1. Tim. 2. Galat. 1.

62. And now consider heere I pray yow, *Thomas Mortons Apostolicall* defence by protestations, which more truly perhaps may be called *Apostaticall*, for that he who shall read the monstrous multitude of his malicious and wilfull lyes, which haue bene discouered, and layd open through out his booke, and especially in the second, sixt, and this Chapter, and withall heare him make these solemne protestations against lying, must needs thinke that rather the spirite of *A-*

poſtacy then *Apoſtleſhip* doth poſſeſſe his tongue, pen, and harte, that ſpeaketh, writeth, and proteſteth ſo deſperatly, and directly againſt his deedes, knowledge and Conſcience: which thing that yow may the better vnderſtand, I am content to adioyne alſo this next enſuing chapter for better proofe, and confirmation therof.

OF

OF TVVO SORTES OF EQVIVOCATION.

The one true and lavvfull; the other falſe, and ſynfull.

And that Catholickes only vſe the firſt in certayne caſes, and with due circumſtances, and limitations:

But T. M. and his fellowes impugning the firſt, do vſe ordinarily the ſecond, which is falſe & lying Equiuocation indeed.

CHAP. XII.

HITHERTO we haue declared, and made manifeſt (as I ſuppoſe) that all Equiuocation is not lying, both for that the definition of a lye agreeth not thervnto, & for that Chriſt himſelfe, and many of his ſeruantes both in the old and new Teſtament haue vpon iuſt occaſions vſed the ſame, and the common conſent of Catholicke Deuynes and Lawyers haue allowed, and confirmed the lawfulnes therof in cer-

tain Caſes, with due and iuſt circumſtances, and conſiderations.

2. But now muſt we further diſtinguiſh the ſame into two different ſortes or kyndes, the one *proper*, according to the true nature of Equiuocation before defyned, which though it may ſeeme to haue falſitie in it, and ſomtymes alſo hath in deed, in reſpect of the wordes only or vnderſtanding of the hearer: yet alwayes hath it truth in reſpect of the ſpeakers meaning. The other ſorte is *improperly* called Equiuocatiō, for that no way it is true, & therfore his proper name in deed is a lye, though after a large & improper manner, it may be called alſo *Equiuocation* for the reaſon which after we ſhall declare.

Two ſortes of Equiuocations with their ſubdiuiſions.

3. Now then both of thoſe kyndes of Equiuocation are ſubdeuided againe ech one into two ſortes, for that true Equiuocation may be either verball or mentall, as before hath byn ſhewed. Verball is that, when any word or ſpeach hath either naturally, or by peculiar cuſtome of particular language, two or more ſignifications, as out of *Ariſtotle* hath bene declared. Mentall Equiuocation is, when any ſpeach hath, or may haue a double ſenſe, not by any double ſignification, or compoſition of the wordes themſelues, but only by ſome reſeruation of mynd in the ſpeaker, wherby his meaning is made different frō that ſenſe which the wordes that are vttered do beare, or yeeld without that reſeruation. And of both theſe ſortes of Equiuocations that they are lawfull, and free from falſity, and may be vſed without ſyn in certaine caſes before ſpecifyed, we haue now layd forth ſo many examples out of Scriptures and Fathers in the precedent Chapters, as it were a needles worke to name them heere againe.

Cap. 9. & 11.

4. Wherfore all our ſpeach in this place ſhall be about the ſecond kynd of Equiuocation, which is falſe and

and lying, and therby alſo euer vnlawfull; which though not properly, yet in a generall manner may be called Equiuocation, as I haue ſaid, for that the hearer is alwayes wrongfully deceyued, or intended to be deceaued by ſome falſity, which is knowne to be ſuch by the ſpeaker, and conſequently is playne lying: and for that lying hath byn ſhewed alſo before to be deuided into two ſortes, the one a materiall lye, when the thing ſpoken is falſe in it ſelfe, but not ſo vnderſtood by the ſpeaker, the other a formall lye when the ſpeaker doth know it, or thinke it to be falſe, and yet ſpeaketh it. This kynd of Equiuocatiõ which really is a lye, muſt haue alſo the ſame ſubdiuiſiõ, ſo as the one ſort therof may be called a materiall lying Equiuocation, and the other a formall: and ſo much worſe, as a formall lye is in it ſelfe (which alwayes is ſinne) then a materiall (which oftentymes may be without ſinne of the ſpeaker:) by ſo much is a formall lying Equiuocation worſe, then a materiall. We ſhal giue examples of both that ſhall make all playne.

Falſe and lying Equiuocatiõ

Supra c.7.

5. If one ſhould ſay to me that my Father is dead, thinking in deed that he is dead, though he be a liue, it were a materiall lye, as before hath byn declared, for that in deed my Father is not dead, though he perhaps that made the lye may haue ſaid it without ſinne, for that he thought it ſo: and I ſay (*perhaps*) for that in ſome caſe ignorance could not excuſe him, if it were a matter wherof he were bound to know the truth, & might with diligence haue learned the ſame. But if he ſhould ſay, *my Father is dead*, knowing in deed that he is not dead, and meaning to deceiue me therby, this is a formall lye and alwayes ſinfull, either veniall or mortall, according to the importance of the matter, wherin the lye is made. And conforme to this may be the diuiſion alſo as is ſaid of lying Equiuocation.

6. Examples of the firſt may be theſe, and other like: An *Arian* deliuereth to the people thoſe wordes of Chriſt, *Pater meus maior me eſt*, My Father is greater then I, vnderſtanding it heretically according to their meaning of the very Godhead: this is an Equiuocation, and in his ſenſe is falſe, and conſequently a lye, for that the hearer is deceaued, and yet becauſe the ſpeaker thinketh it to be true, the lye is but materiall in the *Arian*, and not formall, and in that reſpect leſſe ſynne then if it were formall: but yet is it damnable by another way, for that this error, as hath bene ſaid, being wilfully defended againſt the Church is not excuſable. The other ſorte of falſe Equiuocatiõ called *formall*, is when the hearer conceyueth any falſe thing vpon the ſpeach of another, which other knoweth it alſo a be falſe, and ſo vttereth a lye ãgainſt his owne knowledge, and conſcience. As for example: If a preacher in *England* who in deed is no Proteſtant in harte, ſhould preach Proteſtãt doctrine that is falſe, and himſelfe ſhould thinke it alſo to be falſe (as diuers perhaps doe) this were to Equiuocate both falſely and formally, which is the worſt kynd of lying Equiuocation that may be, and this is that which I ſay that *Thomas Morton* and his fellowes, who inueigh bitterly euery where againſt true and lawfull Equiuocation, do vſe almoſt at euery turne.

Foan.

Materiall falſe equiuocation.

Formall falſe equiuocation vvhat it is.

7. As for example when he ſaith, *No one iota of Scripture, no one example in all antiquity, no one reaſon in the naturall wit of man, no one Author Greeke or Latin, no one Father, no any Pope Chriſtian or Antichriſtian, doth make for Equiuocation as we defend it, or any color therof: neither did they ſo much as fancy any ſuch thing.* Heere is firſt ſeene a notorious vntruth of the aſſertion it ſelfe, & conſequently it is a materiall lye, and materiall Equiuocation; for that the matter deliuered is vntrue, aud ſecondly it is moſt probable that *Th. Morton* muſt needs know it to be a lye

Formall lying equiuocation in T.M.

lye; hauing ſeene ſo many Authors & reaſons alleadged for it by the Catholicke Treatiſe, which he pretendeth to confute; wherof it followeth, that it was a formall lye alſo, and a formall lying Equiuocation in the higheſt degree of deceipt and falſhood.

8. And ſo in like manner in the former Chapter when he alleadgeth *Azor*, *Dominicus Sotus*, and *Cicero* directly againſt their owne meaning, words and drifte in the very ſame places, which he cyteth, and taketh words out of them for his pretẽded purpoſe, he could not but ſee, and know that it was a lye, to cyte them to the contrary, and yet he thought beſt to do it, and tell his Reader that they were of a contrary opinion: this then is formally to lye and equiuocate in the worſt and ſuperlatiue degree of falſe Equiuocation.

9. About which poynt the Reader may be remitted to the ſecond Chapter of this Treatiſe, and laſt paragraph therof, where he ſhall ſee diuers examples laid togeather; as among other, that which he reporteth of the death of our Englih Pope *Adrian* choaked (as he ſaith) with a flye, and cyteth *Nauclerus* for the ſame, who though he mention, yet refuteth expreſly that fable, which T. M. concealed, where he is ſhewed in like mãner to corrupt notably a paſſage of Doctor *Boucher*, auouching him to ſay that which he expreſly impugneth about the killing of a Tyrant by a priuate man, and priuate authority. And the like corruption he is conuinced to haue vſed in cyting *Gratian* the Collector of the Canon-lawes, and his *Gloſſes*, peruerting their wordes, and whole ſenſe, as is there ſet downe, with ſundry other examples, which ſhew that the man did not lye of error or ouerſight, but meerely out of malice to deceyue the ſimple and credulous *Reader*, knowing indeed, that he did lye. And the ſame is demonſtrated by many examples moſt apparent, and euident throughout the whole ſixt

T. Mortõs talents in lying equiuocation.

Chapter

Chapter of this booke, and other places: ſo as if we had no other proofe of this ſpirite, but in *Tho. Morton* himſelfe, it were ſufficient to proue our purpoſe, for that of all other lightly of his coate, he profeſſeth moſt innocency, ſimplicity, and ſincerity in this behalfe, and by this doth principally proue our purpoſe, which is, that they equiuocate and lye, both wittingly and willingly, and then moſt of all, when they make greateſt proteſtation of truth.

10. As when T.M. talketh of his *naked innocency* in his epiſtle to the Kings Maieſtie, *of deteſting Equiuocation from his ſoule*, of ſtyling himſelfe *A Miniſter of ſimple truth:* and finally his vſurping of thoſe proteſtations of *Saint Paul* before mentioned, *That in all things he ſpake the truth, and lyed not*, which *Thomas Morton*, as we often haue proued before, could not chooſe but know to be a wilfull lye in deed, hauing ſeene & read the Authors which ſo manifeſtly he belyeth, as neuer in this he will be able to cleare himſelfe. And herof we do finally inferre that he and his do equiuocate in the worſt kind, which by vs & ours is neuer vſed: and ſo while he declameth againſt lawfull Equiuocation, and practiſeth vnlawfull, he ſheweth himſelfe a playne preuaricator. And for that this matter is of ſo great importance for the Reader well to conceaue in theſe dayes of controuerſies betwene vs, I meane to ſtay my ſelfe ſomewhat in this Chapter vpon this poynt, and to ſhew that indeed it is a ſubſtantiall ſigne, diſtinctiue betwene all Sectaries & vs, at this tyme, and that in matters of controuerſy our writers ſhall neuer be found guylty in theſe kyndes of falſe lying & malicious equiuocatiõs, where not only vntruth is vttered, but it is wittingly alſo vttered, the writer knowing that he writeth vntruth, as often now hath bene ſaid. Which manner of dealing inferreth two points; the one that ſuch a writer or ſpeaker hath no conſcience

ſcience that vttereth things againſt his owne knowledge, and which God ſeeth to be falſe, and falſely meant in his harte, and the other that his cauſe hath no ground of ſubſtantiall truth, which cannot be defended without ſuch wilfull lyes.

11. In this then if yow pleaſe let vs inſiſt a while, and let *Thomas Morton* bringe forth any Catholicke Authors whatſoeuer, that wrote againſt Proteſtãts ſince theſe hereſies began, that hath bene taken in this impiety, I meane, that hath ſet downe in print any ſuch falſity, as cannot be excuſed eyther by ignorance, ouerſight, negligence, error of print, tranſlatiõ, diuerſity of editions, or the like, but that it muſt needs be preſumed that he knew the vntruth, and yet would ſet it forth: of this kynd (I ſay) let him ſhew me but one example among all Catholicke writers of our tyme, and I will in my conſcience greatly miſtruſt, and diſcredit the Author, whether it be another, or my ſelfe: But if he ſhew me two or three in any writer of this kind I ſhal neuer be able to beleeue him more. And wheras the number and variety of Catholicke writers is ſo great as the world ſeeth, it were no great labour to ſhew it in ſome, if that ſpirite did raigne among them, as it doth in Proteſtant writers, out of whom great volumes might be framed of this one point, if a man would imbrace them all throughout all nations: But I meaning to ſpeake of Engliſhmen, and thoſe very few in reſpect of the multitude, and not hauing al their workes by me at this preſent, am forced only to vſe ſome few notes taken heertofore out of their books, which notwitſtanding ſhall ſuffice for this ſhort view, which we pretend. And for better methode & memory, I haue thought good to reduce my Notes at this tyme to three ſortes of men, that haue writen againſt vs. Firſt Proteſtant Biſhops; then Miniſters, and laſtly Lay-men, but of

good ſorte, I meane, Knightes; and of ech one of theſe ſhall we make our ſeuerall Paragraphes.

The vſe of Equiuocation in ſome Proteſtant English Biſhops. §. 1.

12. AND firſt in this ranke may we worthily put in the firſt and chiefe place, *M. Iohn Iewell* called afterwards Biſhop of *Salisburie*, who being the firſt and chiefeſt man that in the beginning of Queene *Elizabethes* raigne, tooke vpon him the publicke defence of *Caluins* doctrine in England, and was named by many for that reſpect, *The Iewell and prim-roſe of that Ghoſpell*, had *primitias ſpiritus* in that behalfe, for cunning and artificial deluding of others by theſe kind of falſe, and deceyuing Equiuocations, as both by his wordes, workes, preachinges, and proteſtations, extant this day in print, is moſt manifeſt, and the conuerſion of many men, from Proteſtant to Catholicke Religion, vpon ſight and conſideration therof, hath euidently cõuinced, wherof heere we meane to giue ſome brieſe taſte for examples ſake.

M. Iohn Ievvell B. of Saliſbury.

13. He then, as wel in his Sermons at *Paule croſſe*, and the *Court*, ſet forth afterward in print, and anſwered as well by Doctor *Harding*, as other learned men of the Catholicke party, did make ſuch a generall and vniuerſall chalenge againſt all Catholickes whatſoeuer, for proofe of 28. ſeuerall articles, framed out by himſelfe, ſtandinge in controuerſy betweene vs, as he made the world to wonder at him, and diuers of his owne ſide that were more learned and diſcreete, to murmur at his raſhnes therin; but many more with great

great diſdayne to condemne his hypocriſy. For thus he began.

14. O mercifull God, who would thinke there could be ſo much wilfulnes in the harte of man! *O Gregorie, O Auguſtine, O Hierome, O Chryſoſtome, O Leo, O Dionyſe, O Anaclete, O Sixtus, O Paul, O Chriſt!* if we be deceaued herein yow are they that haue deceyued vs: yow haue taught vs theſe ſchiſmes & diuiſions; yow haue taught vs theſe hereſyes. *&c.* and that yow may the more maruaile at the wilfulnes of ſuch men, (*the Papiſtes*) they ſtand this day againſt ſo many old Fathers, ſo many Doctors, ſo many examples of the primitiue Church, ſo manifeſt Scriptures, and yet haue they herein not one Father, not one Doctor, not one allowed example of the primitiue Church, I ſpeake not this in vehemency of ſpirit, or heate of talke, but euen *as before God by way of ſimplicity and truth*, leaſt any of yow ſhould happily be deceaued, and thinke there is more weight in the other ſide, then in cõcluſion there ſhalbe found, and therfore once againe I ſay of all the wordes of the holy Scriptures, of all the examples of the Primitiue Church, of all the old Fathers, of all the ancient Doctors in theſe cauſes, *they haue not one.* Thus in that Sermon at *Paules* croſſe, and in an other at the Court of the ſame ſubiect, which was the occaſion and beginning of all the Combat that enſued afterwards betweene Catholicke men and him.

Maiſter Ievvells chalenge and hipocriticall apoſtrophe in his printed ſermon. Fol. 41.

15. And in another Sermon to the ſame effect he vſeth this ſpeach for confirmation of his former proteſtation. Heere (ſaith he) the matter it ſelfe that I haue now in hand, putteth me in remembrance of certayne thinges that I vttered vnto yow to the ſame purpoſe at my laſt being in this place, I remember I layd out then before yow a number of thinges, that are now in Controuerſy, whervnto our aduerſaryes will not yeeld; And I ſaid perhaps boldly as it might

Singuler hipocriſy.

then ſeeme to ſome man, but as I my ſelfe, *and the learned of our Aduerſaryes themſelues do well know, ſincerely and truly, that none of them all that ſtand this day againſt vs*, are able or * ſhall euer be able to proue againſt vs, *any one of all theſe pointes*, either by Scriptures, or by example of the primitiue Church, or by the old Doctors, or by the ancient generall Councells *&c.*

*Yet afterwards he denyeth diuers Doctors that make againſt him.

16. And againe. Loth I am to trouble yow with rehearſall of ſuch thinges, as I haue ſpoken before, and yet becauſe the caſe ſo requireth, I ſhall deſire yow, that haue already heard me, to beare with me in this behalfe, better it were to trouble your eares with twice hearing of one thing, then to betray the truth of God. The wordes I then ſpake, as neere as I can call them to mynd were theſe; *that if any learned man of all our Aduerſaries, or if all the learned men that be aliue be able to bring any one ſufficient ſentence out of any old Catholicke Doctor, or Father out of any one old Generall Councell, out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitiue Church, wherby any of theſe enſuing articles*, of priuate Maſſe reall preſence, Primacy of the Biſhop of Rome, ſetting vp and honoring of Images, Common prayer in a ſtrange language, offering vp Chriſt in ſacrifice *&c. may be proued, I am content to yeeld and ſubſcribe &c.*

All the learned men aliue cannot bring one ſentence.

In his firſt anſwere to Doctor Coles letter fol. 4.

17. And againe in an other place: My offer was this (*in my ſermon at the Court:*) that if any of all thoſe things that I then rehearſed could be proued by your ſide, by any ſufficient authority, either of Scriptures, Councels, or by any one allowed example *&c. I would yeald: now it ſtandeth vpon yow to proue but one example to the contrary.* And yet further in an other place in my Sermon (ſaith he) at *Paules*, and els where, I required yow to bring forth on your parte, either ſome Scripture, or ſome old Doctor, or ſome ancient Councell, *&c.* and if yow of your parte would vouchſafe to bring *but two lines*, the whole matter were concluded. And yet fur-

In his ſecond anſwer to D. Cole fol. 13.

Ibid. fol. 21.

ther,

ther, I proteſt before God, bring me but one ſufficiēt authority, or one old Doctor, on your ſide, and I will yeeld &c. At leaſt yow ſhould haue alleadged *Auguſtine, Ambroſe, Chryſoſtome, Hierome*, &c. I haue offered yow oftentymes bring me *but two lines of your ſide*, and the field is yours &c. O M. Doctor deale ſimply in Gods cauſe, and ſay yow haue Doctors when yow haue them indeed. Ibid. fol. 26. In his reply to D. Coles laſt letter fol. 44. Ibid. fol. 65. Ibid. fol. 112.

18. This and much more hath he to this effect, all tending to ſhew his rare confidence in the Proteſtant cauſe, which he defended: but yet that he did not ſpeake as he thought, in theſe matters, and that his iudgement did not concurre with his tongue and pen, and conſequently, that he did Equiuocate in this worſe ſorte of Equiuocation, many argumentes do mightely perſwade me, and eſpecially theſe halfe dozen that follow.

Sixt argumentes of Maiſter Iewell his hipocryſy in this caſe. §. 2.

19. FIRST for that he cannot be preſumed to haue beene ſo ignorāt, but that howſoeuer he might thinke of the Scriptures, that by his priuate interpretations he could ſhifte them of, and deliuer himſelfe from their Authority: yet that the Fathers could not ſo eaſily be diſpached, wherof he had ſeene the profe but few yeares before, in the diſputation held in *Oxford* with *B. Cranmer, Ridley*, and *Latymer*, vpon the 16. 17. and 18. dayes of Aprill in the yeare of *Chriſt* 1554. in which diſputation, *M. Iewell* as *Fox* ſaith, was *Notary* among others, and ſaw ſo many moſt euident teſti- The firſt reaſon.

monyes, of auncient Fathers, both Greeke and Latyn alleadged there, and vrged againſt them, as they could no wayes anſwere, or handſomely ſhifte of, as yow may ſee in *Fox* himſelfe, though neuer ſo partially related, but much more orderly & fully in a ſpeciall Treatiſe, writen of late of that matter intituled, *A Reuiew of ten publicke diſputatiõs, about Religion, vnder the raignes of K. Edward and Queene Marie*: which euidency of teſtimony did worke ſo greatly with *M. Iewell* himſelfe, as after theſe diſputatiõs ended, he ſubſcribed publikly in *S. Mary*-Church of *Oxford* to the Roman Catholicke doctrine in that behalf, as *M. Doctor Harding* then preſent writeth to himſelfe, in a ſpeciall Epiſtle prefixed before his Reioynder: which being ſo, with what conſcience, could he ſay now ſo ſoone after; *Shew me one only Father, one Doctor, one place, one ſentence, two lynes and the like?* for ſo much as lately before he had heard and regiſtred ſo great a multitude of Fathers ſentences, that are yet extant in thoſe diſputations; wherfore this muſt needs be Equiuocation of the worſt kynde, which could not be true, neyther in the meaninge of the ſpeaker himſelfe.

See in the end of the ſecond parte of the examẽ of Fox his Calender parag. 5.

20. The ſecond reaſon is, that *M. Iewell* could not be ignorant, that diuers ancient Fathers within the tyme by him limited, had not only many ſentences for the Catholicke parte in theſe heades of controuerſyes alleadged by him, and others, but whole diſcourſes alſo, homilyes, ſermons, chapters, and treatiſes, if not bookes therof. As for exãple about the reall preſence, if he had read the Fathers he could not be ignorant of the mayne multitude of large Authorityes, alleaged in theſe our dayes aſwell by Biſhop *Claudius de Sainctes*, as *Bellarmin* and others about that matter, not out of ſingle, or doubtfull ſentẽces, but of whole diſcourſes, as hath bene ſaid, and thoſe as effectually writen by the Authors for the truth of the reall preſence, as we

The ſecõd reaſon.

See Bellarm. lib. 2. de Euchariſtia.

can

can do in a manner now, as namely *S. Cyprian*, *S. Hilary*, both *Cyrills*, *S. Ambroſe*, *S. Baſil*, three *Gregories*, *Saint Chryſoſtome*, *S. Hierome*, and others downward. And the like multitude, or more, is alleadged for the Maſſe or dayly ſacrifice of the Catholicke Church by the ſame Author. And further no man can deny, but that *S. Auguſtine* for example, hath many large diſcourſes, treatiſes, or Bookes directly tending to the proofe of diuers poynts now in controuerſie, betwene Proteſtants and vs, as *De cura pro mortuis habenda. De libero arbitrio. De fide & operibus. De nuptiis & concupiſcentia*, & many others, where he doth largely, and of purpoſe impugne diuers Proteſtant opinions, and confirme ours both about the valour of the Maſſe, or dayly ſacrifice for quicke and dead, merite of workes and the like, not only approuing, but prouing alſo the ſame by great variety of Scriptures. And the like doth *S. Hierome* againſt *Iouinian* and *Vigilantius*, and *S. Epiphanius* againſt *Aërius*, and other heretickes that held the ſame propoſition that Proteſtants do now. All which authorityes, if *M. Iewell* had read or heard of them (as may be preſumed he had) how then could he ſay with any conſcience at all, *Bring me one Author, one Father, one Doctor, one ſentence, one place, or two lines*, and the like, which he could not do without notable Equiuocation as yow ſee, himſelfe knowing that he ſpake falſely in that behalfe.

21. The third reaſon is that *M. Iewell* could not but haue ſeene and conſidered the ſmall accoumpt which other Proteſtãt writers more elder then himſelf had made, and did make of the ancient Fathers, when in any thing they were againſt their opinions, nay their reiecting of them with contempt, doth euidently ſhew that they held them for their aduerſaries. As for example *M. Iewell* beginneth his chalenge, as yow remẽber: *O Gregory! O Auguſtine! O Hierome! O Chryſoſtome* The third reaſon.

Caluin ad c.2.Habac. ſoſtome! O Leo! O Dionyſe! &c. Now as for S. Gregory, Caluin giueth this generall ſentence of him: *Gregorius homo multis erroribus imbutus*, Gregory a man corrupted with many errors: and *Martyn Luther* the Father of Proteſtants writeth of him: *Gregorius admodum leuiter agnouit Chriſtum, & verbum Euangelij*; Gregory did know Chriſt and his ghoſpell very ſleightly: and then talking of S. *Gregories* famous workes and writing, ſo greatly eſteemed by learned, and holy men, he ſaith of his ſermons: *Gregorij conciones ne teruncium quidem valent*; Gregories ſermons are not worth a halfpenny. And then ſpeaking of an other parte of his workes, or bookes called his Dialogues, ſaith: *Diabolus eum in Dialogo ſuo craſſè decepit*: The dyuell did groſſely deceaue him in his Dialogues: and thus of him.

Luther.ad c.49.Gen.

Luth. in colloquio Germ. fol. 499.

22. And as for *S. Auguſtine*, who is the ſecond in ranke of his *Apoſtrophe*, albeit they do not reiect him with ſo great contempt as *S. Gregory*, yet when he maketh againſt them, they eſteeme him little. *Quis eſt Auguſtinus?* (ſaith *Luther* againſt King *Henry* of England) *quis nos coget illi credere?* Who is Auguſtine? or who ſhall compell vs to beleeue him? but *S. Hierome* whome next *M. Iewell* adioyneth they handle much more ſpitefully. *Quinte Hieronyme* (ſaith Luther) *conculcamus cum tua Bethlem, cuculla, & deſerto*: Know thou *Hierome* that we do tread thee vnder our feete with thy Bethlem, thy hood, and they deſert. And againe in an other place. *What can be more carnally ſpoken, more wickedly, ſacrilegiouſly, and blaſphemouſly, then that of* Hierome, *Virginitas calum, coniugium terram replet?* Virginity doth fill heauen, & marriage filleth the earth. And yet further, *I know no man* (ſaith he) *to whom I am ſo much an enemy as to* Hierome, *for that he writeth nothing but of faſting, choiſe of meates, and of virginity, and in truth* Hierome *ſhould not be numbred among the Doctors of the Church for that he was an heretick, &c.* And *Calum* ſaith of the ſame Doctor; *Hieronymus*

Luth. cōt. lib. Reg. H 8. de ſacra.

Luth. ad c.22. Gen.

Lib. de ſeruo arbitrio.

In colloq. conuiual. de Schol. Theol.

Calu. ad c. 4. Ioan. v. 14.

vir

vir natura fuit cauillator: *Hierome* was by nature a wrangler. But *Beza* worse then all, calleth him *blasphemous, wicked, and impious, and iniurious to the Apostle.* *Beza ad c. 13. Act.*

23. Of *S. Chrysostome* whom *M. Iewell* calleth vpon in the fourth place, *Luther* writeth thus: *Chrysostomum nullo loco habeo; non est nisi loquaculus*: I hold *Chrysostome* in no accompt at all, for that he is a brabling fellow. And the *Magdeburgians* in their historie say of him contemptuously, that he was, *bonorum operum Encomiastes, & liberi arbitrij patronũ agebat*, a prayser of good workes, and an aduocate for freewill. So that yow see, that the cause of their reiection, and contempt is for that they are contrary in their doctrine. As for *S. Leo* named by *M. Iewell* in the fifth place of Fathers, it is easy to imagine of what credit he was among them, seing that in the very controuersy of the Popes *Supremacy* heere handled by him, both Caluin and Beza do note and cõdemne him of Ambition, for taking vpon him, and defending that authority. *Constat* (saith Beza) *Leonem in epistolis Romanae Sedis antichristianae arrogantiam planè spirasse*; It is manifest that *Leo* in his Epistles doth clearly breath forth the arrogancy of that Antichristian *Roman* Sea, which in other wordes *Caluin* also *Beza* his maister, doth confirme: which being so and all this knowne to *M. Iewell*, I would aske, why he did call vpon these Fathers so earnestly, saying, *If we be deceaued heerin, yow are they that haue deceaued vs*, as though he had taught nothing but that they taught, and that their authority had byn his rule, as their aule was *Paul* and *Christ*? Nay, why doth he himselfe afterward, expressely, and by name, reiect *S. Leo* in some of these very articles for proofe wherof he doth here call vpon him? And namely about the Popes Supremacy and sacrifice of the Masse, saying: *That there was no credit to be giuen vnto him, &c.* Is not this double dealing? Is not this pernicious Equiuocation on one

Luth. in colloq. conuiual. c. de Patribus. Magd. cẽt. 5. cap. 10.

Beza in confes. Geneuen. c. 7. § 12.

Calu. li. 4. instit. c. 7. § 11.

Ievvell in defence of the Apology pa. 111.

ſide to call vpon him & on the other to reiect him?

24. Nay why did he adde further, *O Dionyſe, O Anacletus, O Sixtus*, as though he had followed their doctrine alſo, or admitted their authority? wheras neither himſelfe, nor other Proteſtantes are knowne to admit any booke or worke of theirs now extant, but to reiect, and rayle againſt them all. *Dionyſius Areopagita*, (ſaith *Luther*) *nihil habet ſolidæ eruditionis*. Dionyſius Areopagita hath no ſolide learning at all. *Your counterfeit* Anacletus (ſaith *M. Iewell* to *Doctor Harding*) *doth not clayme all the Biſhops throughout the world as belonging to his admiſſion*. And the like they ſay of the other, out of all with is euidently conuinced, that this Apoſtrophe of *M. Iewell* to theſe Fathers, *O Gregory, O Auguſtine, O Hierome, O Chryſoſtome, O Leo, O Dionyſe, &c. if we be deceaued yow haue deceaued vs*, was an hypocriticall Equiuocation to deceaue the hearer, contrary to the knowledge, and conſcience of himſelfe, that vttered the wordes, for he could not be ignorant, but that they were againſt him, and his doctrine, for that otherwiſe they had neuer byn ſo reiected and diſcredited by him, and his.

Luth. ad c. 7. Deut.

Ievvell Ibidem pag. 130.

The 4. reaſon.

25. The fourth reaſon is, for that the ſaid ancient Proteſtantes, Maiſters of *M. Iewell*, and from whome he tooke his learning and ſpirite, did in ſundry of the Articles heere by him named, reiect & contemne the ancient Fathers as contrary vnto them, and their doctrine; and how then could *M. Iewell* ſo confidently call vpon them in the ſame. Let any man read *Martin Luther* in his booke *de Captiuitate Babylonica*, about the Sacrifice of the *Maſſe*, and he ſhall fynd, that he reieeteth all the Fathers in that controuerſy. *Si nihil habetur* (ſaith he) *quod dicatur, tutius eſt omnia negare, quàm Miſſæ Sacrificium eſſe concedere*. If there be nothing to anſwere to the Authorityes of the Fathers, it is more ſafe to deny all, then to grant that the Maſſe is a Sacrifice. And in an other booke; *Profiteor inprimis &c.* I do

Luth. de Capt. Babyl. c. 1.

do in the very beginning make this profeſsion, againſt thoſe that will cry out, that I teach againſt the vſe of the Church and decree of Fathers heerin, that I reſpect none of theſe thinges. And yet further againſt King *Henry* of England: *Dicta Patrum induxit Rex &c.* The King bringeth in the ſayings of Fathers againſt me, for his maſsing Sacrifice, and ſcoffeth at my folly, that I would ſeeme more wiſe then all they; but this is that which I ſaid before, that theſe *Thomiſticall aſſes* haue nothing to bring forth, but a multitude of men. And then he goeth forward, ſaying: That if a thouſand *Auguſtines*, and a thouſand *Cyprians* ſtand againſt him in this matter, he careth not. And fynally in another booke: *Non moramur, ſi clamitent Papiſtæ, Eccleſia, Eccleſia, Patres, Patres &c.* We care nothing at all if Papiſts cry out againſt vs, the Church, the Church, Fathers, Fathers, they are but the ſayings or deeds of men, in ſo great a cauſe as this, we care nothing for them. And to the very ſame effect diſputeth *Caluin*, though more cyuilly and cunningly about the ſame matter, ſaying: *Non eſt cur vlla hominum authoritate, vel annorum præſcriptione, &c.* There is no reaſon why we ſhould ſuffer our ſelues to be drawne a ſide from the doctrine we teach by any authority of men, or preſcription of yeares. Where yow ſee, that he graunteth both antiquity of time, and authority of the ancient Fathers to be againſt him, in that controuerſy of the Maſſe, and Sacrifice. And as we haue ſhewed the ſame in this article; ſo might we in all the reſt, if time and place did permit, but this is ſufficient to proue, in my opinion, that the proteſtation of *M. Iewell* before mencyoned which ſo ſolemnly he made in the preſence of almighty God, was feigned, and hypocriticall, when he ſaith, *Not one father, not one Doctor &c.* and then addeth for more aſſeueration, *when I ſay* not one, *I ſpeake not in vehemency of ſpirite or heate of talke, but*

Lib. de abroganda miſſa initio.

Lib. contr. Reg. Angl.

Libr. de miſſa priuata.

Calu. lib. 4. inſtit. c. 18. §. 12.

A ſtrange kinde of ſimplicity vttered vvith duplicity.

euen as before God, by the way of simplicity and truth. For if *M. Iewell* did know that this his maisters and elders, *Luther* and *Caluin* were forced to reiect generally all the Fathers, or the most parte of them, for that they were against him for the sacrifice of the Masse; then was it notable cosening Equiuocation to sweare & protest before God in simplicity, that no one did make for vs, either in this or the rest of the articles.

The fifth reason. 26. The fifth reason is, for that we see by experience that all other English Protestant writers, succeeding *M. Iewell*, and being as it were his schollers, and participating of his spirite, sense, and meaning, began presently to reiect, and cast of the Fathers, vpon euery occasion, wherin they were pressed, by their authority, as by the writings of *Doctor Calsthill*, *Doctor Humfrey*, *Fulke*, *Charke*, *VVhitakers*, and others is euident, wherof I will alleadge only one example out of the last named, in steed of all, who being pressed with the consent of Fathers in a certaine controuersy against him, answered in this wise. We repose no such confidence in the Fathers writinges, that we take any certain proofe of Religion frõ them, because we place all our Faith and Religion, not in humaine, but in diuine Authority. If therfore you bring vs what some one Father hath thought, or what the Fathers vniuersally altogeather haue deliuered, the same, except it be approued by testimonyes of scriptures, auayleth nothing, it gayneth nothing, it conuinceth nothing. For the Fathers are such witnesses, as they also haue need of the Scriptures to be their witnesses. If deceyued by error they giue forth their testimony disagreeing from Scriptures, albeit they may be pardoned, erring for want of wisdome; we cannot be pardoned if because they erred, we also will erre with them. So *Doctor VVhitakers*. Where yow see what accompt he maketh of ancient Fathers, and Doctors. *Patres etiam simul*

D. VVhitakers answvere to D. Sanders demonstrat. pag. 21.

ſimul vniuerſi, to vſe his owne wordes, yea all Fathers put togeather without proofe of Scripture to Authorize them, *it auayleth nothing* (ſaith he) *gayneth nothing, it conuinceth nothing.* So as if *M. Iewell* had dealt plainly he might only haue called for Scripture at our hands, and not ſo often for Fathers, knowing by all probability, aſwell as his ſchollers, that the Fathers were at leaſt in many controuerſyes againſt him; and what Equiuocation then was this to call ſo often, and earneſtly for ancient Fathers; yea *ſome one place or ſentence, ſome two lines, for wynning of the field*? was not this ſinguler and extraordinary, yea hypocriſy, and lying Equiuocation in the higheſt degree?

27. The ſixt reaſon is the conſideration of his earneſt exhorting of Catholickes to anſwere his Chalenge. *Now it ſtandeth vpon yow* (ſaith he) *to proue but one affirmatiue againſt me, and ſo to require my promiſe of ſubſcribing.* And againe, *If yow of your parte would vouchſafe to bring but two lynes, the whole matter were concluded.* And yet further, *Me thinketh both reaſon, and humanity would, that yow ſhould anſwere ſomewhat, eſpecially being ſo often and ſo openly required, &c. VVhy be yow ſo loth, being ſo earneſtly required to ſhew forth but one Doctor of your ſide, &c. VVhat thinke you there is now iudged of you, that being ſo long tyme required, yet cannot be wonne to bring forth one ſentence in your defence?* And yet againe more earneſtly. I proteſt before God bring me but one ſufficient authority in the matters I haue required, and afterward I will gently and quietly conferre with yow further at your pleaſure. And therfore for as much as it is Gods cauſe, if yow meane ſimply, deale ſimply, betray not your right, if yow may ſaue it with one word: the people muſt needs muſe at your ſilence, for thinke not that any wiſe man will be ſo much your friend, as in ſo weighty matters he will be ſatisfied with your ſaid ſilence, &c. And not content with this, he concludeth in theſe wordes of earneſt

The Sixt reaſon.

Iewell in his 2. anſwere to D. Cole.

Feruent deſire of M. Iewell to haue his vvritings anſwered.

„ exhortation. Wherfore heere I leaue putting yow eft-
„ somes gently in remembrance, that being so often
„ and so openly desired to shew forth one Doctor, &c.
„ Yow haue brought nothing, and that if yow stand
„ so still it must needs be thought yow do it *conscientia*
„ *imbecillitatis*, for that there was nothing to be brought.
„ And heere once againe I conclude, as before, putting
„ yow in remembrance that this long tyme I haue de-
„ sired yow to bring forth some sufficient Authority
„ for proofe of your party. Thus farre M. Iewell.

28. And would yow not thinke that this desire, this intreaty, this vrging, and prouocation did proceed from a great confidence in his cause? Truly if the confidence were not great, the crafte and dissimulation was singuler: but what ensued? *M. Doctor Harding*, and other learned men lying in Flanders being moued by zeale of Religion, and prouokd by these insolent eggings, began soone after to write bookes in answere of these challenges, and to lay open the vntruthes and vanities therof, which labours wrought so great effect with diuers of the discreeter sorte, both Catholickes, & Protestants in England, as *M. Iewell* thought it best to procure the publike prohibition of those bookes by the *Magistrate*, for which he had so earnestly called before, wherupō there were diligēt searches made to find out the same, both in the vniuersities, townes, cittyes, & portes of the Realme, as * one that was then a searcher among others, and a Protestant preacher in *Oxford*, but conuerted afterward by these very reasons, and by the vntruthes found in *M. Iewell* bookes, doth testifie at large in an answere of his written to M. D. *VVhitakers*, whose wordes I haue thought good to sett downe in this place. For hauing refuted a speach of *M. VVhitakers* who pretended to be very glad that the *Rhemes* English Testament was abroad in many mens handes, *M. Reynolds* writeth thus: With like

The bookes so earnestly called for procured by M. Iewell to be forbidden.

* M. VVilliam Reynoldes.

like phraſe (ſaith he) and character of ſhameleſſe vaunting, wrote *M. Iewell* to Doctor *Harding*, ſaying: *VVe neuer ſuppreſſed any of your bookes*, M. Harding, *as yow know, but are very well content to ſee them ſo common, that as now children may play with them in the ſtreets.* Thus his face ſerued him to write then, when in the ſelfe ſame *Defence*, he by leauing out ſuppreſſed the very ſubſtance of that booke, which he then pretended to anſwere, and when by helpe of his fellow *Superintendent*, and other friends euery corner of the Realme was ſearched for thoſe bookes, when the portes were layd for them, *Paules* Croſſe is witnes of burning many of them, the Princeſſe proclamation was procured againſt them in the Vniuerſityes by ſoueraigne authority, Colledges, chambers, ſtudyes, cloſſets, coffers and deskes were ranſacked for them, when not only children were forbid to play with them, but ancient men, and ſtudents of Deuinity were impriſoned for hauing of them, ſo that all this can be nought els, but a plaine example of palpable diſsimulation, and affected lying.

M.VV. Reynoldes in the refut. of M.VVhitak. cap. 15. pag. 460.

29. So this learned and vertuous man, who was ſo moued by the ſaid diſsimulation, as it wrought his conuerſion, and deteſtation of that doctrine, which could not be mainteyned but with ſuch ſhiftes, and cunning lyings as afterward more largely, and particulerly yow ſhall heare him relate of himſelfe, for that conforme to this generall entrance by ſinguler hypocriſy and equiuocation as hath beene declared, *M. Iewell* behaued himſelfe alſo in particuler caſes that did occurre, making no ſcruple to affirme or deny any thing that ſerued for his purpoſe, though in his conſcience he knew it to be neuer ſo falſe, wherof we ſhall heare touch ſome few examples proportionable to the number of reaſons before ſet downe, if not more; in which is to be remẽbred by the Reader, that

all

all the forsaid circumstances must be obserued, to witt; that the falshood cannot be excused by any probable error, mistaking, or ouersight of the speaker, nor by any default of the Printer, edition, translation, or the like, but that it must needs proceed of a setled will to deceyue wittingly, as before hath byn said. And with this preuention, and admonition shall we passe to the examples themselues.

Six Examples of Maister Ievvells *particuler Equiuocation.* §. 3.

The first example.

30. THE first example then shall be where *M. Iewell* going about to prooue in a certain sermon of his, that it was no synne to marrie after vowes made of Chastity, bringeth in this sentence of *S. Augustine* out of his booke * *de bono viduitatis*, to proue the same in these wordes: *Quapropter nō possum dicere à proposito meliori lapsas si nupserint faminas adulteria esse non coniugia*: I cannot say that women which are fallen from a better purpose (of continency) if they marry, that their mariage is adultery and not mariage at all: and vpon this authority so alleadged, and so plainly seeming to make for the Protestants doctrine of *Votaries mariages*, yow must imagine how *M. Iewell* would exult, and make the Schollers of *Oxford* thinke that he had said much for his purpose; but he that shall read ouer that shorte booke *de bono viduitatis*, of the good that is in wyddowhood, written to *Iuliana* a religious seruant of God, as *S. Augustine* calleth her, shall fynd that the whole drifte of this holy Father in that place, is directly against *M. Iewell*, and his fellowes, prouing by many

* *Cap. 10. M. Iewel in his sermon at S. Peters in Oxford in the Lent.*

many arguments, that albeit marriage in them that haue made a ſimple vow of Chaſtity, or (to vſe *S. Auſtines* wordes) that had a better purpoſe then mariage, be true mariage, and not adultery (except there come afterward a ſolemne vow, which maketh it no mariage:) yet doth *S. Auguſtine* plainly proue, that the ſlyding backe from that good purpoſe and vow is damnable, not for that the mariage doth not hold, but for that they haue broken their firſt faith made to *Chriſt* according to the wordes of *S. Paul*, which *S. Auguſtine* affirmeth to haue byn meant to this purpoſe.

S. Auguſt. egregiouſly abuſed and falſified.

1. Tim. 5.

31. So then heere is great wilfull falſity, to alleadge *S. Auguſtine* as though he fauoured the marriages of Votaries, whereas throughout this whole booke he doth purpoſely impugne the ſame, yea that which is more, in the very next immediate wordes that follow in the ſame ſentence before alleadged by *M. Iewell* *S. Auguſtines* expreſſe wordes do ouerthrow all that is alleadged for Votaries. For wheras he writeth, I cannot affirme that women fallen from a better purpoſe if they marry, that their marriages are adultery, and not marriage, it followeth immediately: *Sed plane non dubitauerim dicere lapſus & ruinas à caſtitate ſanctiori, quæ vouetur Deo, adulteriis eſſe peiores*: but I do not doubt at all to affirme (ſaith *S. Auguſtine*) that the ruynes, and fallinges of from holyer chaſtitie, which is vowed to God, are worſe then adultery; which he proueth by many ſtrong reaſons, and arguments. And now let the Reader conſider what Equiuocation this might be in *M. Iewell*, and whether it be poſsible to imagine that he was ſo occupyed, and diſtracted, as he did read the one halfe of the ſentence, and not the other, or that he was ſo ſimple as he did not vnderſtand, what was the whole drifte, and argument of *S. Auguſtine* in that booke: and if he did, and yet alledged him to the contrary, yow ſee what enſueth. And

thus much of this first example.

The secõd example.

32. The second example is taken out of *M. Iewells defence of the Apologie of England* pag. 176. where taking againe in hand to proue that priests and Votaryes may marry (for he was very frequent and copious in that matter, it importing them much in that beginning to draw priests and fryers vnto them by this bayte) he alleadgeth an example of a certayne noble man called *Eupsychius* of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia* taken out of *Cassiodorus* the historiographer in these wordes. *At that tyme they say that* Eupsychius *the Bishop of* Cæsarea *dyed in martyrdome, hauing marryed a wyfe a little before, being as yet in manner a new marryed man &c.* and he cyteth for this in the margent Cassiodorus in the tripartite historie. And in an other place he alledgeth the same example to the same purpose, out of *Nicephorus*; but aswell these two authors, as *Zozomenus* are witnesses against him, of a notable wilfull falsification in this behalfe; for that neither of them do say that *Eupsychius* was a *Bishop* or priest, but only that he was *Patritius Cæsareæ in Cappadocia* that is to say a noble man, or Senators sonne of *Cesarea* in *Cappadocia*: and the falsification is so playne to him that shall read all the foresaid Authors, and places by him cyted, as no modest man can but blush to see *M. Iewell* alledge, and vrge this forged example twice in one booke of his with such apparant falsitye: nor can any of the foresaid circumstances of ignorance, error, or negligence probably excuse or defend him.

Cassiod. li. 6. cap. 14.

Hist. trip. lib. 6 c. 14.

Niceph. l. 10. hist. c. 10.

Zozomen. l. 5. c. 11.

Pag. 176. & 514.

The third example.

33. The third exãple may be that of *M Iewels* slaunderous speach cõcerning the holy man *Augustine* sent by *S. Gregory* to conuert our nation to the Christian faith, which Almighty God wrought by him so myraculously, as both the said *S. Gregory* and *S. Bede* after him, and all other ancient historiographers, as *Malmesbury*, *Huntington*, and the rest do call him our English *Apostle*, of whose many, and great miracles wrought in that

Worke,

worke, not only the ſaid Authors, but *S. Gregory* himſelfe doth write a ſpeciall narration to *Eulogius* Archbiſhop of *Alexandria*: yea *Iohn Fox* himſelfe in his Acts and Monumentes, albeit not a little imbued with *M. Iewels* ſpirit, againſt this holy man, for that he planted Catholicke Romane Religion in *England*, yet writing the ſtory of the conuerſion of *Ethelbert* our firſt Chriſtian Engliſh King, he hath theſe words at lēgth. When the King had well conſidered the honeſt conuerſation of their life, and moued with their miracles wrought through Gods hād by them, he heard them more gladly, and laſtly by their wholſome exhortations, and example of Godly life, he was by them conuerted, and Chriſtened in the yeare of Chriſt aboue ſaid 596. and the ſix and thirtith of his Reigne. So *Fox*. Whervnto I may adda teſtimony of much greater credit, out of *S. Bede*, that liued neere vnto his time, & recordeth the very Epitaph remayning in his dayes written vpon *S. Auguſtines* tombe in theſe wordes.

Greg. l. 7. Epiſt. 30. indict. 1. Fox act. & monu. pag. 105. col. 2. nu. 5.

34. *Heere lyeth Bleſſed Auguſtine the firſt Archbiſhop of Canterbury, who was ſent hither, by S. Gregory Biſhop of* Rome, *and ſtrengthened of God by working of miracles, who conuerted King* Ethelbert, *and his Realme from the worſhipping of Idolls to the faith of Chriſt.* And thus much of the ſanctity of this bleſſed man out of their teſtimony that liued with him, or not long after him. But now what writeth M. *Iewell* of him, and with what truth and conſcience? *He was a man* (ſaith he) *as it was iudged by them that ſaw him, and knew him, neither of Apoſtolicke ſpirite, nor any way worthy to be called a Saint, but an Hypocrite, a ſuperſtitious man, cruell, bloody, and proud aboue meaſure,* and for proofe of all this, he cyteth only in his margent *Ieffrey* of *Monmouth*, in his hiſtory of the *Britans*, which *Ieffrey* dyed in the dayes of King *Henry* the 2. very neere 600. yeares after *S. Auguſtine*, and almoſt 500. after *S. Bede*, and writeth no ſuch thing at all of *S. Auguſtine* as heere

S. Auguſt. Epitaph. Beda lib 2 cap. 3 hiſt. Angloru.

M. Iewells raylingagainſt S. Auguſtine in his Reply pag. 185.

is ſet downe by *M. Iewell*, but rather much in his commendacion with note of the emulous dealing of the *British* Biſhops againſt him, for the hatred they bare to the *English* nation, and their conuerſion.

35. So as heere now *M. Iewels* aſſertion is not only falſe, and impious againſt ſo venerable a man as *Auguſtine* was, but muſt needs be alſo againſt his owne conſcience, & this in diuers pointes. For firſt he knew that there was no Author extant that wrote in his dayes, ſaw him, and knew him, but only *S. Gregory*, who writeth highly in his commendations, as yow haue heard. Secondly he knew that *S. Bede* who liued in the very next age after him, and all other Engliſh Authors ſucceeding for the ſpace of eyght or nine hundred yeares, till our time, did highly cõmend him in their workes, and eſpecially the forenamed *Malmeſbury* & *Huntington* that liued with *Ieffrey Moumouth*. And laſtly he knew that this only witnes, the ſaid *Ieffrey*, had no ſuch thing. And what then will yow ſay to this Equiuocation? may not *M. Mortons* Epithets of helliſh, *heathenish*, *impious*, *and ſacrilegious*, haue place heere?

The 4. example.

Ievvel in the Apol. 4 part.

36. The fourth example may be thoſe wordes of *M. Iewell* in the Apology of England, writing againſt the Pope. *Let him in Gods name* (ſaith he) *call to mynd, let him remember that they be of his owne Canoniſts which haue taught the people, that fornication betwene ſingle folke is not ſynne, as though they had fetched that doctrine from* Mitio *in* Terence, *whoſe words are: It is no ſynne, belieue me, for a yong man to haunt harlotts.* And for this he cyteth in his margent *Io. de Magiſtris li. de Temperantia*. And who would not thinke but that this accuſation were ſure, for ſo much as it is ſo opprobriouſly vrged and inſulted vpon? But now I pray yow conſider the particulers, and therwithal what a conſcience this man had.

37. Firſt then *Io. de Magiſtris* was *Martinus de Magiſtris*, not

not a Canoniſt, but a Schoole-deuine, that wrote a Treatiſe *De Temperantia & Luxuria*, ſo as it ſeemeth that he that gaue this charge eyther had not read the Author himſelfe, which I ſuppoſe *M. Iewell* will not confeſſe, or elſe meant to dazle the eyes of his Reader by naming *Iohn* for *Martin*. Secondly this Author in his ſaid Treatiſe, as the faſhion of Scholemen is, propoundeth this queſtion: *Vtrum ſimplex fornicatio ſit peccatum mortale*; whether ſimple fornication be a mortall ſynne; and according to vſe of Schooles, ſaith: *Arguitur quòd non.* It is argued or reaſoned for the negatiue parte thus, and ſo layeth downe ſome arguments for that ſyde by way of obiections, which afterward he ſolueth, and cometh to conclude abſolutly in the affirmatiue parte by ſix concluſions, that ſimple fornication is not only ſynne, but mortall ſynne; for that it is forbidden by Gods law, and excludeth from the Kingdome of heauen, as *S. Paul* affirmeth. And now lett any man conſider of the conſcience of him, that auoucheth in print the other ſlaunder: Would *Maiſter Garnet* or *M. South-well*, or any other Catholicke man accuſed for lawfull Equiuocation, euer haue made ſo notorious a lye againſt their owne conſciencies? Let our aduerſaryes bring forth but two examples.

Martinus de Magiſtris ſhamefully abuſed.

1. Cor. 6.

38. The fifth example ſhall be alſo out of his wordes in the ſame Apologie, writing againſt the reading of Saincts lyues in the Church: *The old Councell of Carthage* (ſaith he) *commaundeth nothing to be read in Chriſts congregation, but the Canonicall Scriptures, but theſe men read ſuch things in their Churches, as themſelues know to be ſtarke lyes, and fond fables.* So he. But now let vs ſee, whether it be more probable, that we know to be lyes thoſe thinges which we read in our Churches or that he knew to be a lye that which heere he relateth and printeth in his booke. For if he read the Canon it ſelfe which he mentioned, which is the forty and ſeauenth

The 5. example.

uenth of the third Councell of *Carthage*, wherin *Saint Augustine* was present, then must he needs know that he lyeth indeed egregiously, for that the Canō beginneth thus: *Item placuit, vt præter Scripturas Canonicas nihil in Ecclesia legatur sub nomine diuinarum Scripturarum; sunt autem Canonica Scriptura, Genesis, Exodus &c. Tobias, Iudith, Hester, Machabæorum libri duo, &c.* It hath seemed good to this Councell, that nothing be read in the Church vnder the name of diuine Scripture, but only such as be Canonicall Scriptures in deed, as are Genesis, Exodus, &c. The two bookes of the Machabees, Tobias, Iudith, Esther, and the rest. Wherby we see that in alleadging these words, *that nothing be read in the Church but Canonicall Scriptures*, is guylfully cut of the other clause that expounded all, *sub nomine diuinarum Scripturarum*, vnder the name of diuine Scriptures. And secondly, that in relating which are diuine Scriptures, the bookes of the *Machabees*, *Tobie*, *Iudith*, and others excluded by him and his, from that number, are set downe for Canonicall. And thirdly which maketh the falsification most notoriously wilfull, is, that in the selfe same Canon there followeth these wordes: *Liceat etiam legi passiones Martyrum cùm anniuersarij dies eorum celebrantur*: It is lawfull also to read in the Church (*besides Canonicall Scriptures*) the passions of Martyrs, when their yearly festiuall dayes are celebrated: which wordes do cleerly decide the controuersy, and proue *M. Iewell* a wilfull lyer, and that he did know that he did lye, as nothing can be more cleare or euident. And besides, they decyde two seuerall controuersies against them as yow see, the first, that the books of *Machabees* were held for Canonicall by this Councell in *S. Augustines tyme*: and the second that the festiuall dayes of Saincts were celebrated euery yeare publikely in the Church, and the histories of their liues read in those dayes.

39. The

39. The sixt and last example in this place (for I haue promised to passe no further) shall cõteyne two or three cases togeather, the first out of *Leo* the great. *Pope Leo*, (saith M. Iewell in the Apologie) *holdeth, that vpon one daye it is lawfull to haue but one masse in one Church, but these men say dayly in one Church commonly ten masses 20. or 30. yea sometimes more.* So M. *Iewell*. But he that shall looke vpon the place it selfe in *S. Leo*, shall find the quite contrary decreed, and sett downe by that holy man, for thus he writeth vnto the Archbishop or Patriarch of *Alexandria*: *Vt in omnibus obseruantia nostra concordet, illud quoque vloumus custodiri, &c.* That our vse or obseruance may agree in all poynts (as well in *Alexandria* as heere) we will haue this also to be kept, that when any more solemne festiuity shall call togeather a more aboundant meeting of people, and that the multitude of the faithfull shall be so great as the Church or Chapell cannot hold them togeather, that then without doubt of further deliberation, the oblation of the sacrifice be iterated, or celebrated againe, least otherwise if they only which came first, should be admitted vnto this deuotion, they which came afterward might seeme to be excluded, wheras it is conforme both to piety and reason, that so often as the presence of new people do fill the Church wherin the solemnity is exhibited, so often also should the sacrifice be offred, for that otherwise it must necessarily fall out that some parte of the people should be depriued of their deuotion, if the custome of saying one masse only being reteyned, none could offer sacrifice but such as came in the first parte of the day.

The 6. example cõteyning 3. cases.

1. *Leo epist. 81. ad Dioscorum.*

Leo epist. 81. ad Dioscorum Alexan. Episcopum.

40. These are the wordes of *S. Leo*, by which yow see that he doth determine & decree the plaine contrary to that which *M. Iewell* affirmeth, to wit that as oftẽ as any multitude of people should come to the Church; so often the sacrifice of the masse should be reiterated

for

for their deuotion. In which wordes though among Catholiks there may be ſome queſtion about *S. Leo* his meaning, to wit, whether he meant of more then one chiefe or ſolemne maſſe, to be ſaid in one Church or Chappell, or that one and the ſelfe ſame Prieſt in ſuch caſes might reiterate his owne maſſe and ſacrifice, if there were no other Prieſt preſent, as *Strabo* and *Durand* do interpret him: yet in this controuerſie there can be no doubt or queſtion, but that he ſaith the quite contradictory to that which *M. Iewell* affirmeth him to ſay, who telleth vs, *that Pope Leo ſaith, that it is not lawfull to ſay vpō one day more then one maſſe in one Church*; wheras *S. Leo* ſaith, it is both lawfull, expedient, and neceſſary to be done. What Equiuocation then call yow this in *M. Iewell*? And furthermore *S. Leo* in this place as ſupreme Biſhopp, preſcribeth and giueth order in Eccleſiaſticall rites as yow ſee, to *Dioſcorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, for offering and iterating the ſacrifice of the *Maſſe*, wherby is euident, that in theſe two articles at the leaſt of *Supremacy* & *the Maſſe* (which are of the firſt and principall that *M. Iewell* ſetteth downe) *S. Leo* was againſt him, and flatly for vs: ſo as it may pleaſe him now to leaue out of his *Apoſtrophe*, *O Leo!* if we be deceaued, your haue deceaued vs, &c. And this for the firſt caſe.

Strabo de rebus Eccleſiaſticis cap. 21. Durand. lib. 2. de ritibus Eccleſiaſticis cap. 7.

2. 41. The ſecond caſe may be that of *M. Iewell* in the defence of the Apologie pag 131. where talking of the moſt excellent man *Pope Celeſtinus* that ſatte in the Sea before *Leo*, he ſaith of him thus: *Pope Celeſtinus was a Neſtorian heretike*; but cyteth no Author at all for it, and the aſſertion is ſo ſtrange, and ſo contrary not only to truth and reaſon, but alſo probability, as of no man he could haue ſpoken it more falſely and abſurdly: for that it was *Celeſtinus* that condemned *Neſtorius*, and all his hereſyes: it was *Celeſtinus*, in whoſe place *Cyrillus* the Archbiſhop of *Alexandria* ſate Preſident in the third generall

Pope Celeſtinus egregiouſly calumniated by. M. Iewell.

generall Councell at *Epheſus*, where *Neſtorius* was accurſed, and condemned. Of this *Celeſtinus* the learned Biſhop *Proſper*, who then liued writeth: *Neſtorianæ impietati præcipua Alexandrini Epiſcopi induſtria & Papæ Celeſtini repugnat authoritas:* The ſpeciall diligence of the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, and the Authority of Pope *Celeſtinus* reſiſteth the impiety of *Neſtorius*. And yet is Pope *Celeſtinus* a *Neſtorian*. Who would ſay ſo, but *M. Iewell*, who careth not what he ſaith?

42. The third Caſe is ſomwhat more pleaſant, though no leſſe malicious, for wheras it had byn obiected vnto *M. Iewell* for the prehemınence of *S. Peter*, in feeding & gouerning, that *Chriſt* had ſaid to him alone: *paſce oues meas, paſce agnos meos*, feed my ſheepe, feed my lambes; *M. Iewell* to refute this priuiledge, alledgeth a ſentence of *Chriſt* out of *S. Markes* ghoſpell, quoted in the margent: *Quod vni dico omnibus dico*: What I ſay to one, I ſay to all, therby inferring that the foreſaid wordes of Chriſt to *S. Peter*, as a ſo the other, *Thou art* Peter *or a rocke, and vpon this rocke will I buyld my Chruch*, and other ſuch like ſpeaches, were equally meant alſo of the reſt, wheras in deed, Chriſt neuer vſed theſe wordes, *Quod vni dico omnibus dico* nor is it to be prued out of Scripture; but rather our Sauiour hauing made in *S. Marks* Ghoſpell a large Sermon about the day of Iudgement, and the terror therof, and exhorted all ſortes of people to be watchfull, extended the ſame alſo vnto thoſe that were abſent or ſhould liue in ſucceeding ages ſaying: *Quod vobis dico, omnibus dico, vigilate.* That which I ſay to yow heere preſent I ſpeake to all both abſent, & to come, be *watchfull*: which laſt words *M. Iewell* leaueth out of purpoſe, to couer and conceale the meaning of our Sauiour, and addeth of himſelfe, *quod vni dico*, which our Sauiour hath not. And thirdly he peruerteth wholy the meaning of *Chriſt*, which was to perſwade attention, and watchfulnes about

3.

Ioan. 2.

Ievvell defence of Apol. 108.

Marc. 13.

Chriſtes vvordes egregiouſly abuſed by. M. Ievvell.

the day of Iudgement, and applyeth it againſt the preheminence of *S. Peter* his Authority, which he well knew to be farre from our Sauiours meaning. And moreouer there enſueth an other moſt groſſe abſurditie, which is that our Sauiour ſpeaking to all & euery one of them that were preſent, when he ſaith, *vigilate* be watchfull, it followeth (I ſay) that in *M. Iewels* ſenſe, and application of his wordes, euery one to whome the word *vigilate* apperteyneth, which are all ſortes and ſexes of people both there preſent and abſent ſhould haue as great ſpirituall authority ouer the Church of God, as *S. Peter*; *quia quod vni dico, omnibus dico*, whatſoeuer I ſay to only *Peter*, to wit, that *he muſt feede*, that *he is the rocke*, and the like, *I ſay to all men*. And now let any indifferent man conſider with what conſcience *M. Iewell* could feigne *Chriſt* to ſay as he alledgeth. For either he had read the place in *S. Marke* which he cyteth, or had not. If not, it was great negligence, the matter, and ſubiect being ſo weighty as it was: and if he did and yet alledged it quite otherwiſe then there it is found, what ſhall we ſay of this fraudulent dealing. What of ſuch lying, and perfidious Equiuocation? who in this can excuſe or defend him for a man of any conſcience at all.

A dilemma about M. Iuells equiuocation.

43. And yet was he (forſooth) the Father and chiefe maiſter of all our *Caluinian* doctrine in Englād, which was firſt eſtabliſhed by Queene *Elizabeth* at her entring (for that *Zuinglianiſme* had bene only admitted in *King Edwardes* dayes) & he was not only held for the chiefe preacher and teacher therof; but for the publicke Champion alſo to defend it, and therfore as the doctrine was falſe; ſo muſt he haue a more ſpeciall eminent gift of cunning and falſhood to beare it out, then other men, for that others were to take *de plenitudine eius*, of his fulneſſe in that ſcience. And albeit he had diuers brethren alſo at that time, that did participate

with

with him of that ſpirite in their writings, as *M. Horne* Biſhop of *VVincheſter* by name, and ſome others; yet were they eſteemed farre inferior to *M. Iewell* in this point, eſpecially in the elegancy of cõueyance, though in will and ſubſtance they might be equall. And ſo if yow looke vpon ſix hundred foureſcore and ten vntruthes, which *Doctor Stapleton* gathered out of one worke of the ſaid *M. Horne* written againſt *Doctor Feck-nam* about the oath of the ſupremacy, yow ſhall fynd as many, and groſſe lyes, as any lightly, of *M. Iewell*, but not ſo ſleightly con eyed, nor ſmoothly faced out.

M. Hornes equiuocations.

44. As for example where he auoucheth flatly that the cõuerſion of our King *Lucius* of *Britanie* and of his whole Realme, & eſtabliſhing therof was done without *any knowledge or conſent of Pope Eleutherius*. is ſo groſſe a lye, as it is refutable by all hiſtoryes from that tyme to ours; yea by *Iohn Fox* & *Bale* themſelues, who were greateſt enemyes to all Popes: So as this matter was not handſomely carryed. And againe in the ſame worke *M. Horne* pretending to alledge ſome temporall lawyers to his purpoſe againſt the Popes Eccleſiaſticall preheminence in *England*, cyteth one *Broughton*, as ſaying: *That the king is Supreme in his Kingdome, and ſaffereth no equall or ſuperior*; and other ſuch pointes which are not denyed when ſpeach is of temporall men and affayres, and he leaueth out diuers other paſſages in the very ſame Author, and place, which he cyteth expreſly, affirming that in ſpirituall, affayres the Pope & Biſhops are to Iudge, & not temporall men, which is the very deciſion of the Controuerſie.

M. Horne to Feckn. pag. 9.

Horne pag. 89. *Broughtõ. li. 1. cap. de Papa. Archiepiſ. & aliis Prelatis.*

45. And in this kind I might alledge an exceſsiue multitude, both out of the one, & the other Biſhops workes, but that the repetition therof would be ouer tedious; albeit it fell not out, without Gods ſpeciall prouidence in that beginning, that ſo notorious falſityes ſhould be vttered and publiſhed to the world by

theſe chiefe ring-leaders: for that ſundry principall Proteſtants, that were curious to read theſe books in that firſt entrance of hereſye, were conuerted & made Catholicke by this ſpeciall and principall motiue, that they found ſo many notorious and inexcuſable vntruthes vttered by theſe principall men in their writinges at that day: wherof I my ſelfe knew ſundry, & in ſome other place haue named three; one in the vniuerſity of *Oxford*, *M. VVilliam Reignolds*, a learned and zealous preacher of the Proteſtant doctrine: the other in the court, *Syr Thomas Copley* (made afterward Lord by the *King* of *France*) a great follower of my Lord of *Liceſter*, and feruent in the new profeſsion, as being extraordinarily well ſeene for a man of his calling in controuerſies himſelf: the third in London *M. Doctor Stephens* Secretary to *M. Iewell* and well ſeene at that time in Deuinity and the learned tongues: all which made change of their Religion, though to their great temporall loſſes vpon the great auerſion they tooke at the diſcouery of the wilfull falſhood of theſe chiefe teachers of new Religion, whervpon the firſt of the aboue named three, maketh this marginall note in a booke of his written againſt *M. Doctor VVhitaker: The incredible lying* (ſaith he) *and falſification vſed by the English writers of our time, are a great motiue to the Catholicke faith.* And then in the text he declareth the matter further in theſe wordes.

M VVill. Reinolds in refut. of VVhitak. pag. 475.

» 46. I know many (ſaith he) who hauing byn brought
» vp not in Catholike Religion, but in hereſie with *M.*
» *VVhitakers* and continuing a long tyme in the ſame,
» and leuing it with all their hartes; yet comming af-
» terwards to better iudgement through the grace of
» God, vpon conſideration of ſuch lying writers, as
» *Maiſter VVhitakers* moſt honour-th, to wit, *Maiſter*
» *Iewell, Maiſter Horne, &c.* haue byn ſo altered, as they
» haue deteſted his ghoſpell, euen to hel gates, of which

number

number I confeſſe my ſelfe to be one. So he. "

47. And ſurely if we conſider the ſpeciall learning and vertu of this man, and how he had read exactly all writhers that could be gotten of the Proteſtants ſide of what ſort or ſect ſoeuer, as by his writings doth well appeare, as alſo with what ſinguler patiẽce, humility, and contentement of mynd he lyued for many yeares after in voluntary baniſhment, and pouerty for loue of the Catholicke Religion, wheras by accommodating himſelfe to the current of the tyme, he might haue receyued great prefermẽt in his country, and was in the way towards them when he lefte the ſame; he will ſay, that this motiue of lying Equiuocation in Proteſtant writers, had made deepe and ſtrong impreſsion in him in deed. And thus much for the Biſhops: now let vs looke into the like ſpirite of *Miniſters* in this behalfe.

The vſe of Equiuocating in English Proteſtant-Miniſters. §. 4.

48. AS for this ſort of men, though it might be ſufficient which before we haue noted and ſet downe out of the writings of this one Miniſter T. M. for proofe of our purpoſe: yet to ſhew the conformity of ſpirit in others alſo of the ſame profeſsion, & coate; we ſhall briefly heere alledge ſome few more examples, and thoſe of the chiefeſt Engliſh Miniſters (for to talke of forraine were infinite) that haue writen againſt Catholike Religion in theſe our dayes.

49. And with whom in this poynt may we better begin, then with *Iohn Fox* himſelfe (not vnfitly called First example of Iohn Fox.

by ſome, *the Father of lyes*) in his huge Volume of Acts and Monuments, who, as he was one of the firſt that tooke vpon him, in our language to ſet abroad the prayſes of that Proteſtant Church by way of hiſtory, ſo did he by deedes leaue a document what liberty the writers of that profeſsiō do take vnto themſelues in this kynd of Equiuocation, that auoucheth falſities, well knowne to be ſuch to the vtterer. For that not only throughout his whole worke doth he vſe the ſame vpon euery occaſion; but euen in the very firſt lynes, and tytle alſo of his booke, promiſing to ſet downe, *The continuance, and ſucceſsion of his ſaid Church, from the beginning to our dayes*: but indeede neuer meant to performe any parte therof, as well knowing that he could not, as by a ſpecial Treatiſe hath byn theſe years paſt moſt euidently made manifeſt, & that the ſaid *Fox* towards the end of his ſaid volume was enforced to begin his broken ſucceſsion, & cōtinue the ſame with notorious condēned heretiks from *Berengarius* downeward, as in that Treatiſe is largely declared; & manifold exāples are layd forth of his voluntary falſhood in almoſt infinite points by him recorded againſt his owne knowledge, and conſcience, as may be ſeene in the Table or Index of that booke vnder the word *Fox*. 50. And finally the ſame Author in the end of the third parte of the ſaid worke, doth in one Chapter conuince him of aboue an hundred and twenty wilfull lyes vttered by him in leſſe then three leaues in his ſaid Acts and Monuments, and thoſe ſuch, as no wayes they may be excuſed, eyther by ignorance, error, or other ſuch circumſtance, which before we haue touched, but muſt needs proceed of voluntary fraud and malice, himſelfe knowing, that it was falſe which he related. One only exāple will I cyte heere out of all the ſaid 120. lyes, wherby yow may make a gheſſe of all the reſt.

The Treatiſe of 3. Conuerſ. of Engl. part. 2. c. 2. 3. 4.

51. The

51. *The Papiſts do teach* (* ſaith he) *moſt wickedly, and horribly, ſaying, that Chriſt ſuffred for Originall ſynne, or ſynnes going before baptiſme, but the actuall ſynnes which follow after baptiſme muſt be done away by mans merits.* And this aſſertion of ours he putteth downe in a different letter, as though they were our owne very wordes, and ſenſe, which is moſt falſe, for that we hold them neyther in wordes nor ſenſe, ſo as the are rather two wicked, and horrible lyes of his, then any wicked, or horrible doctrine of ours.

*Fox pag. 22. nu. 25. See the examen of the laſt 6. monethes of his Calendar ca. 19. n. 17.

52. For firſt we ſay not, *That Chriſt ſuffered only for Originall ſynne*, but for all ſynnes, both originall & actuall, precedent and ſubſequent after our baptiſme. *S. Thomas* his wordes are cleere for our common doctrine in that behalf, *part. 3. q. 1. art. 4. Certum eſt, &c.* It is certayne (ſaith he) that Chriſt came into the world to blot out not only originall ſinne, but all ſinnes, &c. And this is the common doctrine of all Deuynes amongſt vs. The ſecõd poynt alſo, *That actuall ſinnes after baptiſme cannot be done away by mans merit*, but by the merits of Chriſt, and by the grace, and vertue of his ſaid paſsion, is no leſſe euident in all our writings, as you may ſee in *S. Thomas* for all *1.2. q. 114. art. 7.* where he ſaith: *Nullus poteſt mereri ſibi reparationem poſt lapſum, &c.* That no man can merite his ryſing againe after ſynne, but that it muſt needs proceede of the only grace of God, and merite of Chriſt. And the ſame teacheth the *Councel* of *Trent ſeſs. 6. cap. 14. & 16.* &c. So as theſe are two notorious lyes, *in re grauiſſima*, in a matter of moſt moment, as yow ſee, and cannot be imputed to error, or ignorance with any probability. And of the ſame kynd are the other hundred and odde, which before we haue mentioned, and are vttered, as hath byn ſaid, within the compaſſe of three leaues and therby we may take a ſcantling of *Iohn Fox* his Conſciencie in this kind of lying equiuocation

Confutation of Iohn Fox his lyes.

tion

tion when it may make for his aduantage. And this shall suffice for the first example.

2. Exãple. D. Calfhill.

53. The second example shall be out of an other Minister, that liued ioyntly with *Iohn Fox*, to wit, *Doctor Calfhill* of *Christs Church* in *Oxford*, who was a speciall great defender of *M. Iewells* chalenge in those dayes of the primitiue English Protestant Church, to wit, *That no one Doctor, no one Father, no one Councel, no one Authority could be brought for our doctrine*, &c. But when a litle after there were certaine ordinarie disputations appointed euery Saturday in a seuerall isle of the said Colledg-Church, for triall of Controuersies, and for some ostentation of the Protestants confidence therin, those may remẽber that liued in the vniuersity at that tyme, that *M. Bristow*, and some other Catholike students in Deuinity, repayring thither to dispute, forced *M. Calfhill* that was the moderator, to deny or fondly to shifte of so many Fathers, Doctors and other ancient authorities, as most men langhed to heare it: and his owne friends were ashamed at the matter. And when a litle after he wrote a very irreligious, and prophane answere to a certaine Catholike Treatise writen by *M. Martiall* of the Holy Crosse of Christ; he was oftentymes dryuen to the same follies, eyther of open reiecting, or ridiculous shifting of the same Fathers: As for example when *S. Ambrose* writing of the necessity of that signe among Christians, and especially in Churches, sayd; *That a Church cannot stand without a Crosse, no more then a shippe without a mast, &c.* He answereth that it cannot stand without a crosse beame, or crosse p ller, or one piece of tymber shut into another: And do yow imagine that he did think as he said?

S. Ambr. Serm. 55. Calfhill fol. 78.

54. Againe in the same booke where it is obiected out of *S. Athanasius* words against the Gentils, *That infinite miracles were wrought by the signe of the Crosse, as casting*

Athan. li. 2. de Incarnatione.

fling out dyuels, and the like: yea, and that *S. Athanasius* did prouoke the Gentils to come and make proofe therof and Christians to vse the same, saying: *Vtatur signo, vt illi dicunt ridiculè, Crucis &c.* Let him vse against all inchauntments the signe of the Crosse which Pagans call ridiculous, and he shall see the Diuels to be put to flight by i, southsaying to cease, Magicke and poysoning destroyed, *&c.* So *Saint Athanasius*: Whervnto *Calfhill* answereth thus: *If yow gather* (saith he) *that the vse of the Crosse is commendable, because of myracles done; by the same reason the adulterer and thiefe may defend and maintayne their vnlawfull doinges, because as great or greater miracles be wrought by them.* So he. And do yow not thinke that he knew himselfe heere to lye, and egregiously to Equiuocate in the worst sense? And yet further wheras the ancient Father *S. Cyrill* writing against *Iulian* the *Apostata*, that obiected to Christians the vse of making the signe *of the Crosse vpon their forheades, and setting vp the same vpon their doores*, answered: That such speach of the *Apostata* proceeded of wicked thoughtes and sauoured so extreme ignorance, and that the said *Salutare signum*, healthfull signe of the Crosse (so are his reuerend wordes) was made by the Christians in remembrãce of Christes benefites, exhibited in his sacred passion, *&c. M. Calfhill* teacheth his hearer, that this was spokẽ by *S. Cyrill, to excuse the Christians and couer their fault*, as though in deed *S. Cyrill* had bene of the same mynd with *Iulian* the *Apostata* and had misliked the making of that signe as he did, which is manifestly false, and a great slander to the said holy Father. And what then will yow say of this Ministers Equiuocating spirit: in the worst kynd of Equiuocation?

Calf hill fol. 150.

Cyril lib. 6. contr. Iulianũ. Calf hill fol. 172.

55. The third example we shall take out of the writings of *Meridith Hanmer*, and *M. VVilliam Charke*, Ministers, who being charged with a certayne pernicious doctrine of *Martyn Luther* whom they earnestly defended

The 3. Example Meridith Hanmer & VVilliam Charke.

tended, and not being other wiſe able to eſcape, vſed both of them a notorious Equiuocation in this kynd of lying: The doctrine of Luther was this, *That if any woman* (ſaith he) *cannot, or will not proue by order of lawe the inſufficiency of her husband, let her requeſt at his hands a diuorce, or els by his conſent let her priuily lye with his brother, or with ſome other man.* And this doctrine being obiected to theſe two miniſters, *Hanmer* thought beſt (yow may imagine by what Equiuocation) vtterly to deny the thing, as neuer written or ſpoken by *Luther*, inueighing greatly againſt Catholickes for raiſing ſuch a ſlaunder vpō him: but *Charke* doubting leaſt he ſhould be conuinced with *Luthers* owne booke and Edition of *VVittenberge*, durſt not ſtand to this Equiuocation, but deuiſed another farre worſe, to wit, that Luther gaue this Counſell, when he was yet a Papiſt, and therfore, ſaith he, if any ſhame be in this doctrine it lighteth vpon yow and not vpon vs.

Luther ſermone de matri. tom. 5. VVittenb. fol. 120. Hanmer & Charke in their bookes againſt F. Campian.

50. But two things do conuince this of a notable wilfull vntruth. The firſt for that the tyme and yeare being conſidered wherin *Luther* wrote this Sermon, it appeareth euidently that he had left long before the Catholicke vnion: though yet himſelfe ſaid in this place, *that he remayned ſtill with ſome feare and dread of Antichriſt*, which he meant in reſpect that it was yet doubtfull vnto him, whether the Protection of the Duke of *Saxonie* would be ſufficient for his defence, againſt the Pope, Emperour, and other Catholicke Princes that ſought to haue him puniſhed: but when in Proceſſe of time he perceyued in deed that he was ſecure, then he ſaid he would giue other counſell. *Conſilium tale iam tum impertij* (ſaith he) *cum adhuc me detineret pauor Antichriſti; nunc verò ſecùs longè animus eſſet.* I gaue ſuch Counſell, when I was yet vnder ſome feare of Antichriſt; but now my mynd ſhould be to giue farre other counſell. And heere *VVilliam Charke* breaketh of,

Charke in his anſvv. to the Cenſure.

and

and leaueth out the wordes of *Luther* that immediatly follow, and do ſolue the caſe, which are theſe: *Talig; marito, qui adeò mulierem deludat dolis, vehementius * lanificium, immiſſa manu, conuellerem, &c. That laying my handes vpon the lockes of ſuch a husband, that should ſo craftily deceyue a woman, I would vehemently shake or pull him by the lockes.* So he. And what will yow ſay now of the craftie Equiuocation of theſe two Miniſters? which of them had leaſt conſcience, either he that knowing it to be ſo, yet denyed that *Luther* had any ſuch wordes, or the other that confeſsing the wordes, wittingly peruerted the ſenſe, by cutting of that which ſhould make all cleare?

* *Lanificium* is heer much more modeſtly tranſlated, then Luthers meaning ſeemeth to beare.

57. And I might cyte alſo an other like deceiptfull Equiuocation of *VVilliam Charke*, not farre from the ſame place, where being preſſed with ſundry arguments that proue concupiſcence in the regenerate, to be no ſinne, if conſent be not giuen thervnto, and namely by the Authority of *S. Auguſtine*, ſaying: *Concupiſcentia non eſt peccatum, quando illi, ad illicita opera, non conſentitur*; Concupiſcence is not ſinne, when conſent is not giuen thervnto, for working thinges that be vnlawfull; he to auoyd this authority of *S. Auguſtine*, forgeth a place of the ſame Doctor to the contrarie, thus: *S. Auguſtines place* (ſaith he) *is expounded by himſelfe afterward, where he ſaith, Concupiſcence is not ſo forgiuen in baptiſme, that it is not ſinne; but that it is not imputed as ſinne:* and cyteth for his proofe the ſame booke of *S. Auguſtine De nuptiis & concupiſcentia. Cap.* 23. *&* 25. But if yow looke vpon the places, yow ſhall fynd that the Miniſter hath heere of his owne foyſted in the chiefe word, that maketh or marreth all, to wit, *peccatum*, ſinne, for that *S. Auguſtines* wordes are theſe: *Ad hæc reſpondetur, dimitti concupiſcentiam carnis in baptiſmo, non vt non ſit: ſed vt in peccatum non imputetur, quamuis reatu ſuo iam ſoluto, maneat tamen, &c.* To this is anſwered (ſaith *S. Auguſtine*) that

Charke in his anſvv. to the Cẽſure. art. 2.

Aug lib. 1. de nupt. & concup. cap. 23.

„ the Cõcupiſcence of the fleſh is forgiuen in baptiſme,
„ not ſo that it is not: (or remayneth not) but that it
„ is not imputed vnto ſinne, it remayneth ſtill though
„ the guylt therof be taken away. So he. And was not this a ſubtile Equiuocation to make in a trice *S. Auguſtine* to be contrary to himſelfe.

The 4. example. VVilliam Perkins.

58. The fourth example ſhall be of an other Miniſter *VVilliam Perkins*, who though he wrote ſince the other, yet in diuers points hath he our-gone them, as well in this of falſe Equiuocation, as in the deepe humour of phantaſy, by which he hath writen and publiſhed many bookes with ſtrãge tytles, ſome of them conteyning matter, that neyther he, nor his reader (I dare ſay) do vnderſtand, as namely about the Concatenation or tying togeather of cauſes of mans predeſtination or reprobation, and the like: but among other his pretieſt fancy was, to write a booke calling it, *A reformed Catholicke*, which was in deed that which by *Logitians* is tearmed *Implicatioin adiecto*, An implicancy or contradiction of the one word to the other, for that he which is a Catholicke (if we ſpeake of matters belonging to doctrine and beliefe, and not to manners) cannot be reformed, the eſſence of Catholicke Religion conſiſting in this, that all and euery point of the receyued Chriſtian faith be belieued, and nothing more, or leſſe, ſo as if any point muſt be added, taken away, altered or reformed, it is not Catholicke, and conſequently *A reformed Catholicke* in matters of faith, muſt needs be *A deformed Catholicke*, ſuch a one, as *Perkins* in deed deſcribeth, that admitteth one, two, three, foure, more or leſſe points of the common Catholicke receaued Religion: and yet ſtarteth from the fifth or ſixt, as himſelfe beſt liketh, and this calleth *Perkins A reformed Catholicke*, when the belieuer chooſeth to belieue, or leaue what points do pleaſe him beſt: which choiſe we ſay, is properly hereſy, for that

VVhat is properly *Catholick*, and vvhat *Hereſy*.

an

an *Hereticke* is a *Chooſer*, as the Greeke word importeth: and this hereſy or choice in matters of beliefe doth *Perkins* profeſſe to teach his hearer, ſaying: *That he will ſhew them how neare they may come vnto the Romane faith, and yet not iumpe with it*, which is a doctrine common to all hereticks, and hereſies that euer were, for that all haue agreed with the Catholicke faith in ſome points, for that otherwiſe it ſhould be Apoſtacy and not hereſy if they denyed all: yea the *Turkes* and *Mores* at this day do hold ſome points of Chriſtian Religion with the Catholickes; but for that neither they nor heretickes do hold all, therfore they are no true Catholickes, but ſuch Reformed Catholickes as *VVilliam Perkins* would teach his diſciples to be, to wit, properly *Heretikes* by their choiſe of religion.

59. And to the end we may ſee not only the mans folly in chooſing his argument, but his falſhood alſo in proſecuting the ſame, I ſhall lay forth one only example out of his very firſt Chapter that beginneth with his ordinary argument of the *VVhore of Babylon*, and by this one example, let the reader iudge, whether he be not a fit Chaplyn for that honeſt woman, if lying, coſenage, and calumniation be propertyes of her profeſsion. For that hauing ſpent many impertinent wordes to ſhew that the impieties propheſied by *S. Iohn* of the ſaid *VVhore of Babylon*, and Saincts of God to be ſlayne by her; was not meant of the perſecution of *Rome* vnder the Pagan Emperors, but of the Church of Rome now vnder the Chriſtian Biſhopps and Popes, he hath theſe wordes.

Perkins in his refor. Cath. c. 1.

Apoc. 17.

60. This expoſition (ſaith he) of the Apocalips beſydes the Authority of the text, hath alſo the fauour and defence of ancient and learned men: *Bernard* ſaith, *They are the Miniſters of Chriſt, but they ſerue Antichriſt.* And againe, *the beaſt ſpoken of in the Apocalips to which a mouth is giuen to ſpeake blaſphemies, and to make warre with the Saints*

„
„
„
Serm. in Cant. 33. Epiſt. 124.

„ *of God, is now gotten into Peters Chaire as a lyon prepared to his*
„ *pray.* It wilbe ſaid, that *Bernard* ſpeaketh theſe later
„ wordes of one that came to the Popedome by intru-
„ ſion, or vſurpation. It is true in deed, but wherfore
„ was he an vſurper. He rendreth a reaſon therof in the
„ ſame place: bycauſe the Antipope called *Innocētius*, was
„ choſen by the Kings of *Alemaine*, *France*, *England*, *Scot-*
„ *land*, *Spaine*, *Hieruſalem*, with conſent of the whole
„ Clergy and people in theſe nations, and the other was
„ not. And thus *Bernard* hath giuen his verdict, that not
„ only this vſurper, but all the Popes for this many
„ yeares are the beaſt in the Apocalips, becauſe now
„ they are only choſen by the Colledg of Cardinals,
&c. Thus he.

61. And now how many perfidious decepts, and falſities there be in this litle narration is eaſie for any man to ſee, admyre, and deteſt that will but looke vpō the places of *S. Bernard* by himſelfe quoted. For in the firſt place out of his 33. Sermon vpon the *Canticles* where he ſaith: *They are the Miniſters of Chriſt, but do ſerue Antichriſt*, he ſpeaketh againſt the vices of the Clergy, eſpecially of France where he liued in his dayes. And that it is not meant particulerly of the pope, *S. Bernardes* owne words do ſhew in that ve y place, ſaying: *They will be and are Prelates of Churches, Deanes, Archdeacons, Biſhopps, & Archbiſhopps*: ſo as this is falſely brought in to proue any ſpeciall thing againſt Rome, or the Pope, and much more wickedly alledged to proue *Perkins* his expoſition of the Apocalips, againſt Chriſtian *Rome* to be true in *S. Bernardes* ſenſe, which he neuer thought of, or by any leaſt cogitation admitted, as by the whole courſe of his writings to the contrary is euident: no man more extolling the dignity of the Pope, and Sea of Rome, then he, euen then, when moſt he reprehendeth euill lyfe and manners.

Diuers falſifications of S. Bernards vvordes.

62. But the other that followeth is much more fraudulently

dulenty alledged: For if *S. Bernard* complained greatly that in his tyme one *Petrus Leonis*, an vsurper and Antipope, being chosen by the farre lesse number of Cardinals voyces, did by violence notwithstanding *thrust himselfe into the Chaire of Peter, and playe therin the parte of Antichrist*, what was this in preiudice of the true Pope *Innocentius* the second, whome *Saint Bernard* doth call *Christs Vicar*, and highly commendeth him as lawfully chosen by the *maior* part of the Colledge of *Cardinals*, and exhorteth all Christian Kings to obey and follow him, as their high and true lawfull vniuersall pastor? So as heere first *Perkins* maketh a notorious lye in saying, that *Innocentius* by *S. Bernards* iudgement was an Antipope, wheras he proued him expresly in the places heere alleadged to be the true *Pope and Vicar of Christ*, and *Petrus Leonis* to be the Antipope. *Numquid* (saith he) *non omnes Principes cognouerunt, quia ipse est verè Dei electus? Francorum, Anglorum, Hispanorum, & postremò Romanorum Rex Innocentium in Papam suscipiunt & recognoscunt singularem Episcopum animarum suarum?* Do not all Princes know, that *Innocentius* is truly the elected of God? The Kinges of France, England, Spaine, and Romanes do receyue *Innocentius* for Pope, and do acknowledge him to be the singular Bishop of their soules.

Bern. epis. 124.

Vbi suprà.

63. Secondly he lyeth much more apparantly, when he saith, that *Innocentius* was chosen by the said Kings of *Alemaine, France, England, &c.* wheras *S. Bernard* saith not that he was chosen by them, but that he was accepted, followed, & obeyed by them, as true Pope after his election: *Alemaniæ* (saith he) *Angliæ, Franciæ, Scotiæ, Hispaniarum & Hierosolymitarum Reges cum vniuerso clero & populis fauent, & adhærent Domino Innocentio, tanquam filij Patri, tanquam capiti membra.* The Kings of Germany, France, England, Scotland, Spaine, and Hierusalem togeather with their whole Clergy and people do fauour,

Epist. 126. ad Gaufr.

uour, and adhere to Pope *Innocentius* (*he doth not ſay they chooſe him*) as children to their Father, and as members to their head.

64. Thirdly, *Perkins* lyeth moſt deſperately of all in his laſt concluſion, taying: *And thus Bernard hath giuen his verdict, that not only this vſurper, but that all the Popes for theſe many yeares are the beaſt in the Apocalips, becauſe now they are only choſen by the Colledge of Cardinals.* This (I ſay) is a notorious lye; for that *S. Bernard* giueth no ſuch verdict, but alloweth well the election of *Innocentius* by the ſaid Cardinals, ſaying: *Meritò autem illum recipit Eccleſia, cuius & opinio clarior, & electio ſanior inuenta eſt: nimirum eligentium & numero vincens, & merito*: Worthily doth the Church admit him (to wit *Innocentius*) whoſe eſtimatiõ is more renowned, & whoſe election is found to be more lawfull as paſsing the others election both in number and merit of the chooſers. And ſo in theſe few lynes we ſee how many wilfull lyes, and falſifications this Miniſter hath vſed, which cannot be excuſed, eyther by ouerſight, ignorance, or error, but muſt needs be aſcribed to wilfull malice, and expreſſe purpoſe of deceyuing his hearer. And ſo though I might alledge diuers other places to like effect, yet this ſhall ſuffice for one example; yea for all them of that ſorte in this behalfe. For albeit examples without number may be alleaged out of theſe mens workes: yet by theſe few, conjecture may be made of the reſt. I ſhall therfore adioyne ſome three or foure examples more of lay-men, to ſhew the conformity of their ſpirits to their ſpiritual guydes, and ſo make an end.

Perkins in reformed Cath. c. 8.

Ber. epiſt. 125.

The

The vse of Equiuocation in Lay-men and Knightes. §. 5.

65. OF this sorte of men I will alledge only three in this place that in these later dayes haue written against Catholicke Religion, but yet such as are more eminent amõg the rest, they being Knightes all three, whose honorable condition, & state of calling, ought to haue obliged them to defence of truth, and that also by true meanes, and not by sleightes of this worst kynde of Equiuocation, as heer yow shall see them doe. The first is *Sir Francis Hastings* that wrote the iniurious *VVatchword* some yeares past, against Catholickes: The second is *Sir Philip Mornay*, Lord of *Plessis*, that hath written many workes much respected by those of his partiality in Religion. The third is *Syr Edward Cooke* late Attorney of his Maiesty, now a Iudge, and writer against Catholicks. And albeit the second be a French-man borne, yet for that he hath liued much in *England*, and wrote some of his bookes there, and all or most parte of them are presumed to be in the English language, I may well accompanie him with English Knightes in this behalfe.

The Equiuocations of Syr Francis Hastinge.

66. For the first then which is *Syr Francis*, I may be the briefer with him, for that his aduersarie, or Antagonist hath in his Answers to the said *VVatchword*, and *Apologie* therof, often put him in mynd of his Equiuocations against truth, euen then, when himselfe must needs know it to be so, and consequently, that it was not only *voluntarie*, but witting also and wilfull falsitie, wherof I might alledge many particulars, but

two or three ſhall be ynough for a taſt.

67. In his defence of the *VVatch-word* pag. 74. he treating againſt the abuſe of pardons, auoucheth out of ſundry Chronicles, as he ſaith, the ſtorie of the poyſoning of *King Iohn* by a Monke named *Symon*, and this vpon diſpenſatiõ firſt obteyned of his Abbot to do the fact without ſinne, which hiſtorie being taken by him out of *Iohn Fox* his Actes and Monumentes, who affirmeth that moſt of the ancient Hiſtoriographers of our Country do agree in this matter, both of them are conuinced of wilful vntruthes, for that they could not be ignorant, but that of all the old Hiſtoriographers that liued in the time of *King Iohn*, or within two hundred yeares after, no one did euer affirme the ſame, but rather the quite contrarie, ſetting downe other particuler cauſes & occaſions of *King Iohns* death. And further they could not but know, and haue read *Iohn Stowes* Chronicle printed anno. 1592. who hauing made diligent ſearch about this matter, out of all authors of antiquity, could fynd no ſuch thing: and ſo he teſtifyeth in theſe wordes. *Thus* (ſaith he) *haue I ſet downe the life and death* (*though much abbreuiated*) *of King Iohn, according to the writinges of Roger VVindouer, Roger Houeden, Rad. Niger, Rad. Cogshall, Matthew Paris, and others, who all lyued when the King raigned, and wrote for that tyme what they ſaw or heard credibly reported &c.*

A wilfull vntruth.

Iohn Stovv in his Annals in the life of K. Iohn.

68. Now then if this Chronicle of *Stow* was out, and in euery mans hand ſome yeares before *Syr Francis* wrote his *VVatchword*, and that hereby is euident according to all ancient writers, that the foreſaid poyſoning of *King Iohn* by a monke, was neither written, nor reported by any in thoſe dayes; with what Conſcience could *Syr Francis* and *Fox* alledge the ſame againe for a truth? Was not heere wilfull deceipt, nay rather wilfull will and deſire of deceauing?

69. The ſame is layed againſt *Syr Francis* in cyting of ſundry

ſundry others as namely the Authority of *S. Hierome*, for proofe of common prayer in a vulgar tongue, *Tota Eccleſia* (ſaith *S. Hierome*) *inſtar tonitrui reboat Amen*, The whole Church like a mighty thunder doth ſound out *Amen*, inferring therof that all by liklyhood did vnderſtand the language wherin publicke ſeruice was then celebrated, for that otherwiſe they could not ſo anſwere: But marke the fraudes that are in this allegation. Firſt the Knight doth not explicate in particuler what Church it was wherof *S. Hierome* ſpake, nor vpon what occaſion, nor to whome, and ſecondly he doth conceale the wordes that immediatly went before & followed after, for that they made al againſt him. For firſt *S. Hierome* ſpake of the Church of *Rome* in particuler, where the latin tongue being in vſe ſo commonly in his dayes, that it was, as it were, their naturall language, no maruaile though the common people could ſound out *Amen*, they vnderſtanding for the moſt parte the latin tongue: for we ſee alſo that in other Catholicke Countryes where the latin tongue is not ſo commonly in vſe, the common people by vſe and practice can, and do with common voyce ſound out *Amen* in Letanies, and other partes of latin ſeruice; wherfore this circumſtance was fraudulently concealed.

Defence of the 2. Encount. pag 18. *S. Hier. in proem. lib. 2. Comen. ad Galat.*

70. As that other was in like manner, that *S. Hierome* wrote theſe wordes vnto two vowed virgins, *Paula*, and *Euſtochium*, to whom he dedicated his ſaid ſecond booke of his Commentaries vpon the Epiſtle to the *Galathians*, commending vnto them the faith and deuotiō of the Church of Rome aboue other Churches, and yeelding a reaſon why the Apoſtle *S. Paul* did ſo highly commend the *Roman* Chriſtians in his time, both for their faith and obedience, ſaying of the firſt: *I do giue thankes to my God by Ieſus Chriſt for yow all, for that your faith is divulged throughout the whole world*: and in the Rom. 1.

end of the same Epistle, he saith of their obedience in liuing according to their faith: *Your obedience is diuulged into euery place of the world, wherfore I take ioy in yow, &c.* Vpon which testimony of the Apostle *S. Hierome* writeth thus: *Romanæ plebis laudatur fides, &c.* The faith of the Roman people is prayſed by the Apostle, for in what other place of the world is there such cõtinuall concourse vnto Churches, and vnto the Sepulchers of Martyrs as in Rome? *In what place do they so sound out the word Amen, to the likenesse of a certayne heauenly thunder?* Not for that the *Romanes* haue any other faith, but that which all Christian Churches haue, but only that there is greater deuotion in them, and greater simplicity to beleeue.

Rom 16.

71. These are *S. Hieroms* wordes, which if Syr *Francis* had set downe wholy and simply as the lye in him, he saw how they would make against him in diuers poynts, and therfore he willingly and wittingly cut of both the beginning and ending, as yow haue heard, & applied the midst to a wrong sense, neuer thought of by the Author himselfe. And the same is proued against him in the allegation of many other Authors, as of *S. Augustine pag.* 18. of *S. Bede*, and *Arnobius pag.* 34. & 35. and of *S. Chrysostome pag.* 52. all to one end corruptly and fraudulently alleadged for some shew of proofe that publike seruice ought to be in vulgar tongues only: which yet being truly examined make nothing for his purpose, but quite contrary. And thus much in this place for the first Knight.

Aug. in psal. 99. vvarn. Bed & Arnob. ibib. Encont 2. fol. 14. & 15. Chrys. hom 13 in 2. ad Cor. vvarn. En ont. 1. fol 63. En ont. 1. fol. 67. Equiuocation of Sir Philip Mornay.

72. As concerning the second Knight *Syr Philip Mornay* his case is notorious, that hauing published a great booke full of authorities against the Masse vpon the yeare 1599. seeming to shew great learning therin, the same was fond afterward to be so full of deceipts and wilfull falsifications, as a very learned man *Monsieur Peron* then Bishop of *Eureux*, and now Cardinall made

made publike offer to proue aboue fiue hundred ſuch wilfull falſifications to be in that booke, requeſting alſo, by humble ſuite, his Maieſty of *France* to command publike triall with his preſence; as at length it was effectuated in the preſence of the King and great parte of his Nobility, and other learned men on both ſides, vpon the yeare 1600. and 4. of May, as appeareth both by the Kings owne letter extant in print, as alſo by the publike Acts ſet forth by the approbation of the ſaid King and his Counſell.

Actes de la Conference tenue entre le Sieur Eueſque d'Eureux, & le Sieur du Pleſſis, &c. a Foũtain-bleau le 4. de May. 1600. Imprimez chez Anthoine le Marié.

73. In this Conference of tryall, fiue hundred wilfull falſifications being obiected, as I ſaid, to this Knight, and when the tyme grew neere, threeſcore being exhibited vnto him by the ſaid Biſhop out of which to make his choiſe for the firſt dayes tryall, the ſaid *Syr Philip Mornay* choiſe 19. of thoſe, which he thought himſelfe beſt able to defend or excuſe, and of this number alſo he placed in the firſt ranke ſuch as ſeemed to him to be of leaſt enormity, wherof notwithſtãding, the ſtraitnes of tyme permitting only 9. to be handled, he was conuinced publikely in all, and euery one of them, and had ſentence geuen againſt him, by the Iudges, as well Proteſtants choſen of his ſide, as the other that were of the Biſhops Religion: the ſumme wherof I ſhall briefly touch in this place.

In the french printed Actes fol. 54.

74. The firſt was that he had falſified the Schole-Doctor *Ioannes Scotus*, alleadging him as though he had doubted of the Reall-preſence, for that hauing propoſed the queſtion, *whether Chriſt were really in the Sacrament, vnder the formes of bread and wyne*, he did according to the faſhion of Scholes, make arguments to the contrary, ſaying: *Videtur quòd non*, it ſeemeth that he is not ſo there, for theſe and theſe reaſons, which afterwards he ſolueth and holdeth the contrary poſition for true, and Catholike, to wit, that Chriſts body is really there, wherupon the ſentence of the Iudges

Printed actes fol. 52. was, that *Mõſieur Pleſſis in this matter had taken the obiection of Scotus for his reſolution.*

75. The ſecond falſification wherof he was conuinced was that he had alledged Biſhop *Durandus* an other Scholaſticall Author very fraudulently about the controuerſie of *Tranſubſtantiation*, affirming him to ſay, and hold for his owne poſition that which he cyteth only as an obiection out of an other, and anſwereth the ſame. The third and fourth falſifications were, that he had corrupted plainly *S. Chryſoſtome* in two ſeuerall places by him alledged about prayer for the dead, producing two particuler teſtimonyes out of him quite contrary to his owne meaning, and expreſſe wordes. The fifth was out of *S. Hierome* about praying to Saints. The ſixth out of *S. Cyrill* about honouring the holy Croſſe. The ſeauenth out of the *Code* or Imperiall lawes about painting or keruing the ſigne of the ſaid Croſſe. The eight out of *S. Bernard* about honouring our bleſſed Lady. The ninth and laſt of an authority of *Theodorete* about Images.

Act. fol. 46.

Act. fol. 52. & 58.

76. All which places being diligently examined, and Syr *Philipp Mornay* ſuffred to ſay, and alledge what he could for his defence or euaſion, he was conuinced manifeſtly by the ſaid Biſhop of *Eureux*, and ſentenced by all the Iudges to haue committed falſification, and vntrue dealing in them all. And the like would the ſaid Biſhop haue ſhewed, & declared in all the reſt to the number of fiue hundred, if the ſaid *Mornay* could haue byn brought to haue continued the combat, which he would not, as yow may ſee in the ſaid publike Acts printed in French vpon the yeare 1601. with approbation of the King himſelfe. And he that will ſee more particulers of this in the Engliſh tõgue, may read a Treatiſe, or relation therof ſet forth in the yeare 1604. taken out of the foreſaid French publike Acts of the ſaid tryall. And ſo this ſhall ſerue for this

See in the 3. Cõuerſ. 3. p in the end of the firſt 6. moneths of Fox his Calendar.

French

French Knight, wherby yow may ſee the conformity of ſpirit in them all, when occaſion is offered to Equiuocate in the worſt ſenſe.

Equiuocatio of Syr Edvvard Cooke.

77. Our laſt example then ſhall be of S. *Edward Cooke* lately the Kings Attorney, who hauing taken vpon him theſe yeares paſt to be both a ſharpe writer, and earneſt actor againſt Catholiks, ſeemeth therwith to haue drunke alſo of this ſpirite in ſuch aboundant meaſure, as he is like in tyme to ouer-runne all the reſt, if he go forward, as he hath begonne. For that being admoniſhed not long agoe by one that anſwered his laſt booke of *Reportes*, of diuers notorious his exceſſes committed in this kind, he is (men ſay) ſo farre of from correcting, or amẽding the ſame, as he hath not only in a late large declamatiõ againſt Catholicks in a charge giuẽ by him at *Norwich* repeated and auouched againe the ſame exceſſes, but hath adiied others alſo therunto of much more apparant falſity. As for example, he was admoniſhed among other points, that it was a notorious vntruth, which he had writen and printed, *that for the firſt ten yeares of Queene Elizabeths raigne no one perſon of what religion, or ſect ſoeuer did refuſe to go to the Proteſtants Church and ſeruice*; which the Anſwerer confuteth ſo clearly, and by ſo many witneſſes, as a man would haue thought that the matter would neuer haue byn mencioned more for very ſhame; and yet now (they ſay) that the Attorney being made a Iudge, hath not only repeated the ſame, but auouched it alſo againe with ſuch aſſeueration in his foreſaid Charge, as if it had neuer byn controlled, or proued falſe.

See the anſvver of the Cath. Deuine to the 1. p. of Syr Edvv. Cookes Reportes. cap vlt.

78. Nay further they write, that he adioyned with like aſſeueration diuers other things no leſſe apparãtly falſe then this: as for example, that Pope *Pius Quintus* before he proceeded to any Eccleſiaſticall Cenſure againſt Q. *Elizabeth*, wrote vnto her a letter, offering

to

to allow and ratifie the Englisth Seruice, Bible, and Communion-booke, as now it is in vse in that Kingdome, if she would accept it as from him, which she refusing to do, he did excommunicate her; by which tale he acquitteth notwithstanding Catholicks (if yow marke it) from procuring that excommunication for rebelliō, which els where he often obiecteth most odiously against them. For if vpon this cause she were excommunicated, what parte had Catholicks therin? But yet I must needs say, that the fictiō is one of the most vnlikely things. and the most impossible in morall reason, that any man can deuise. For that Pope *Pius Quintus*, albeit some man would imagine him to be so good a fellow as to care for no religion (who is knowne to haue byn most zealous) yet had he aduentured his Popedome by making such an offer, for he should haue allowed of diuers points in the *Communion-booke*, which are held by the Catholike Church for heresy, and so condemned by the Councell of Trent, and other Councels: and now yow know it is a ground among vs, that a Pope that should be an hereticke, or approuer of heresie, therby ceaseth to be Pope; how improbable then is this of *Pius Quintus* his offer. And why had not this letter in so many yeares byn published to the world for the credit of the English seruice, and discredit of the Popes? And yet the voice is, that the *Lord Cooke* did so earnestly auouch this matter, as he pawned therin not only *his credit & honesty* bv expresse termes of protestation: but euen *his faith also to God and man*: A great aduenture no doubt. And for that I assure my selfe that the greater parte of the auditory being discreet men, did imagine it to be quite false, as I, and others in effect do know it to be; it must needs be a great blemish to my Lordes credit at the beginning of his Iudgeship, that in other thinges also he be not belieued.

A notable fiction against Pius Quintus.

Decret. p. 1. dist. 40. ca. 6. Si Papa.

79. But

79. But I vnderſtand that the booke of this ſpeach, or charge now printed is expected ſhortly togeather with ſome other appertayning to the ſame man, and then it may be that ſome body will examine matters more particulerly (eſpecially thoſe that appertayne to the iniuring of Catholickes) and afterward returne with the aggreuances to the Iudge himſelfe (ſeing he is now a Iudge) to giue ſentence of his owne ouerſightes: albeit I muſt confeſſe that as well my ſelfe, as diuers other men haue loſt great hope of his Lordſhip by this accident, for before we did thinke that his ouerlaſhing in ſpeaches when he was Attorney did proceed in great parte of the liberty of that office, and that when he came to be iudge he would reforme his conſcience *ratione ſtatus*, in regard of his ſtate of life; but now it ſeemeth that he is farre worſe, though this (I ſay) ſhalbe lefte by me to others to be diſcuſſed vpon the ſight of the foreſaid printed bookes.

The Lo. Cookes charge againſt Catholickes.

80. My ſpeach at this time ſhall be only about that which paſſed in his booke of *Reportes*, while he was Attorney, and which hath byn diſputed theſe monethes paſt betweene him, and a Catholicke Deuine of our partie, in his anſwere to the ſaid *Reportes*, which anſwere is in England. And albeit therby may eaſely be ſeene the talent which *M. Attorney* had while he was *Attorney* in this kynd of worſt Equiuocation (notwithſtanding his often declamations againſt the other ſorte, that with due circumſtances we haue proued to be lawfull :) yet will I heere adioyne one example more, but ſuch a one as is worth the noting, & bearing away. And it is this.

81. That wheras in anſwering of dyuers lawes, ſtatutes and ordinances which the Attorney alledged out of the raignes of ſundry ancient Kinges, to proue that they did exerciſe ſpirituall authority, and iuriſdiction, the Deuine ſomtymes not hauing the law-

bookes by him, out of which the ſaid lawes or authorityes were cyted, ſuppoſing the allegations to be ordinarily true (for who would ſuſpect lawyers to be falſe in their cytations, that were wont to be accompted moſt exact in that point) did anſwere the ſame with that ſincerity of truth and reaſon, as to a man of his profeſsion appertayned, though ſomtymes alſo he was forced to ſuſpect ſome fraud, and thervpon requeſted ſuch as had commodity in England to ſee the bookes, that they would pervſe the places, and take them out *verbatim*, which ſome haue done, and haue found ſuch ſtore of Equiuocations, and falſe dealing in the alleadging therof, as neuer could be imagined in a man of his calling. I ſhall only ſet downe one example and it ſhall be the firſt that is cyted by him in the whole booke, to wit, of the Charter of King *Kenulphus* of the *VVeſt-Saxons*, vnto the *Abbey* of *Abindon* in *Barkeshyre*, which Charter M. Attorney ſet downe with this preface: *To confirme* (ſaith he) *thoſe that hold the truth, and to ſatisfie ſuch as being not inſtructed know not the ancient, and moderne lawes, &c. theſe few demonſtratiue proofes ſhall ſerue.*

The Deuine deceaued by the ſubtilty of the Lavvyer.

82. And then beginneth he with the ſaid Charter of King *Kenulphus* before the Conqueſt, meaning to proue therby that the ſaid King did giue vnto the ſaid Abbey of *Abindon* ſpirituall Iuriſdiction, by vertue of his temporall Crowne, exempting the ſame from all Authority of the Biſhop, which in deed was done by the Pope, and ſo the Charter it ſelfe doth plainly expreſſe, if it had byn truly related by M. Attorney. And for that the Caſe is not long, I ſhall ſet it downe *verbatim*, as the Attorney hath it in his booke pag. 9. only putting into Engliſh that which is recyted by him in latin, and left without any tranſlation to make the matter more obſcure: and then ſhall wee lay forth alſo the true caſe wherby will be ſeene how true a dealer

King *Kenulphus* his charter notably falſyfyed by M. Attorney. Report. fol. 9.

M. At-

M. Attorney is in thoſe his writinges, and proteſtations, which after we ſhall more largely conſider of. Thus then beginneth the Charter.

83 *Kenulphus Rex &c. per literas ſuas patentes, conſilio, & conſenſu Epiſcoporum, & Senatorum gentis ſuæ, largitus fuit Monaſterio de Abindon in Comitatu Bark. & cuidam Ruchino tunc Abbati Monaſterij &c. quandam ruris ſui portionem, id eſt, quindecim manſias, in loco qui à ruricolis tunc nuncupabatur Culnam, cum omnibus vtilitatibus ad eandem pertinentibus, tam in magnis, quam in modicis rebus, in æternam hæreditatem. Et quod prædictus Ruchinus, &c. ab omni Epiſcopali iure in ſempiternum eſſet quietus: vt inhabitatores eius nullius Epiſcopi, aut ſuorum officialium iugo inde deprimantur; ſed in cunctis rerum euentibus, & diſcuſſionibus cauſarum, Abbatis Monaſterij prædicti decreto ſubijciantur, ita quod, &c.* Thus goeth the Charter as *M. Attorney* alleageth it, which in Engliſh is as followeth.

The charter as M. Attorney alleadgeth it an. 755. *Stanford. lib. .c.39. fol.* 1012.

84. King *Kenulphus, &c.* by his letters patentes with the counſell, and conſent of the Biſhops, and Counſellours of his nation, did giue to the Monaſterie of *Abindon* in Barkſhire, and to one *Ruchinus* Abbot of that Monaſtery, a certayne portiõ of his land, to wit, fifteene *Manſians*, in a place called by the country-men *Culnam*, with all profittes, and commodityes great and ſmall, appertayning thervnto for euerlaſting inheritance. And that the foreſaid *Ruchinus, &c.* ſhould be quiet from all right of the Biſhop for euer; ſo as the inhabitantes of that place, ſhall not be depreſſed for the tyme to come by the yoke of any Biſhop, or his officers, but that in all euentes of thinges and controuerſyes of cauſes, they ſhall be ſubiect to the decree of the Abbot of the ſaid Monaſtery: ſo as, *&c.* And then doth *M. Attorney* continue his ſpeach thus: *This Charter was pleaded in* 1. *H.* 7. *and vouched by Stanford, as at large appeareth; which Charter graunted aboue.* 850. *yeares ſithence, was after confirmed per Eduinum Britaniæ Anglorum Regem &*

Marke M. Attorneyes Inference vpon his ovvne falſification.

Monarcham anno Domini. 955. *by which appeareth, that the King by this Charter, made in Parliament, (for it appeareth to be made by the Counſell, and conſent of his Biſhops, & Senators of his Kingdome, which were aſſembled in* * *Parlament) did diſcharge and exempt the ſaid Abbot from the Iuriſdiction of the Biſhop &c. And by the ſame Charter did grant to the ſame Abbot Eccleſiaſticall iuriſdiction within his ſaid Abbey: which Eccleſiaſticall Iuriſdiction being* * *deriued from the Crowne, continued vntill the diſſolution of the ſaid Abbey in the raigne of King Henry the eight.* So he.

* This is falſe.

* This alſo is falſe.

85. And by this yow may ſee what an important concluſion he doth inferre of the Kinges ſupreme iuriſdiction in ſpirituall affayres at that time. Whervnto the Deuine comming to anſwere, and ſuppoſing that M. Attorney would not falſity or belye his Authors, hauing proteſted moſt ſolemnly *fol.* 40. of his his booke, *that he had cyted truly the very wordes, and textes of the lawes, reſolutions, iudgmentes, and actes of Parlament, all publicke, and in print, without any inference, argument, or amplification, quoting particularly the bookes, yeares, leaues, Chapters, and other ſuch like certayne references, as euery man at his pleaſure may ſee and read them, &c.* The anſwerer I ſay) hearing this formall proteſtation, and ſuppoſing beſides that the man would haue ſome reſpect to his credit and honour in this behalfe, granting all as it lay, anſwered the ſame, as yow may ſee in his booke: but now vpon better ſearch, it falleth out, that this whole caſe was falſely alledged by *M. Attorney* in the very point of the principall controuerſy in hand about the Kinges ſpiritual Iuriſdiction, for that whatſoeuer the Charter did aſcribe expreſly to the Pope, & his Authority, the Attorney ſuppreſsing the true wordes, relateth it, as proceeding from the King, & temporall authority of his Crowne. For proofe wherof I ſhall ſet downe the very wordes of my learned friends letter out of England about this point, after view taken

M. Attorneyes ſolemne proteſtation falſifyed. Report. fol. 40.

of

of the law-bookes themſelues, and then let any man ſay how farre *M. Attorney* is to be credited in any thing he writeth, or ſpeaketh againſt Catholickes.

86. As concerning (ſaith he) the Charter of King *Kenulphus* for the Sanctuary of the Monaſtery of *Abindon*, yow muſt know that *M. Attorney* hath egregiouſly abuſed his Reader in that and other points. For the Caſe ſtandeth thus. That in the firſt yeare of King *Henry* the 7. *Humphrey Stafford* was attainted by Act of Parlament of high treaſon, and tooke Sanctuary firſt in *Colcheſter* in *Eſſex*, & after fled to *Culnam*, and tooke Sanctuary in the Abbey of *Abindon*, and being taken from thence brought vnto the Tower of London, & from thence brought vnto the Kings-bench, he pleaded, that he was drawne by force out of the ſaid Sanctuary of *Culnam*, and prayed his Counſell to plead that poynt, which by all the Iudges of both benches was graunted vnto him. And ſo they pleaded in this manner

The relation ſent out of England about the true charter of K. Kenulphus.

87. *Idem Humphridus per Conſilium ſuum dixit, quod Kenulphus Rex Merciorum, per litteras ſuas patentes, conſilio & conſenſu Epiſcoporum & Senatorum gentis ſuæ largitus fuit Monaſterio de Abindon, ac cuidam Ruchino tunc Abbati Monaſterij illius, quandam ruris ſui portionem, id eſt, quindecim Manſias in loco qui a ruricolis tunc nuncupabatur Culnam, cum omnibus vtilitatibus ad eandem pertinentibus, tam in magnis quàm in modicis rebus in æternam hæreditatem. Et quod prædictus Ruchinus* ab omni Regis obſtaculo, *& Epiſcopali iure in ſempiternum eſſet quietus, vt inhabitatores eius* nullius Regis aut miniſtrorum ſuorum, *Epiſcopiue, aut ſuorum Officialium iugo inde deprimerentur, ſed in cunctis rerum euentibus, & diſcuſſionibus cauſarum Abbatis Monaſterij prædicti decreto ſubijcerentur. Ita quod, &c.* And heere ceaſeth M. Attorney leauing out as yow ſee in his recitall, the wordes that go before, *ab omni Regis obſtaculo, &c.* that the monaſtery ſhould be free from all obſtacle of the King, as alſo

theſe wordes, *vt inhabitatores eius nullius Regis, aut miniſtrorum ſuorum iugo deprimantur*, that the inhabitants be not oppreſt with any yoke of any King or his miniſters. wherby is euident that the King in his Charter did for his part giue exemptions from temporall & royall power: but eſpecially the fraude is ſeen by cutting of the wordes that do enſue, which decyde the whole controuerſy, which are theſe: *Et etiam allegauit vltra quod Leo tunc Papa conceßit dicto Abbati dictas immunitates, & priuilegia. Et quod Eduinus tunc Britania Anglorum Rex, & Monarchus conceßit, quod præfatum Monaſterium omnis terrena ſeruitutis eſſet liberum, quæ à prædeceſſoribus ſuis Catholicis, videlicet à dicto Sancto Leone Papa & dicto Rege Kenulpho &c. Et quod virtute litterarum & bullarum prædictarum, & tempore confectionis earundem, eadem villa de Culnam fuit Sanctuarium, & locus priuilegiatus. &c.* Which in Engliſh is thus. And moreouer the ſaid *Humphrey Stafford* by his Counſell alledged further for himſelfe, that *Pope Leo* had graunted vnto the ſaid Abbot the ſaid immunityes and priuiledges, & that K. *Edwin* then King & monarch ouer all the Engliſh in Britany had graunted that the ſaid Monaſtery ſhould be free from all earthly ſeruitude, which by his Catholike predeceſſors, to wit, the ſaid holy Pope *Leo*, & the ſaid King *Kenulphus*, was graunted; and that at the tyme of the making of the foreſaid letters patentes and Bulles, the ſaid village or towne of *Culnam* was a Sanctuary, and priuiledged place by vertue of the ſaid patents and Bulles.

This decydeth the vvhole Controuerſy and therfore vvas fraudulently cut of by M Attorney.

88. This is word for word the very plea of *Humphrey Stafford* for the Sãctuary of the Monaſtery of *Abindon*, as it was pleaded by his learned Counſell in law, euen as it is recorded in the reportes of the yeares of King *Henry* the ſeauenth, as they are printed by *Pinſon* the law-printer in the tyme of King *Henry* the eight before the Proteſtant religion came vp. And the Lord *Brooke* in his Abridgement of the law, in the tytle of

1. Hen. 7. printed by Pinſon & Brooke tit. Cor. pl. 129.

Corone

Corone, placito 129. doth accordingly ſett downe the ſame caſe, with mencyoning of the *Bulles of Pope Leo* for the ſaid immunities and priuiledges. But all the Proteſtant editions in the tyme of the late Queene *Elizabeth* printed by *Tottell* and *Yeſt-wert* haue committed a notable tricke of falſificatiō in leauing out altogeather theſe markable wordes: *That Leo then Pope did graunt the ſaid immunityes, and priuiledges*, and alſo thoſe wordes of King Edwyn, *which of his Catholike predeceſſors S. Leo & King Kenulphus were granted, &c.* And againe. *By force of the letters, and Bulles aforeſaid the ſaid village of Culnam was a Sanctuary, and place priuiledged.*

A falſification of proteſtat printers.

89. And hereby alſo is euident that the King did not by his Charter in Parliament (for it appeareth to be made by the Counſell and conſent of his Bishops and Senators & not by Parlament, as *M. Attorney* doth miſreport it) neyther was there any Parlament held at that tyme in the land, or many hundred yeares after (for as it appeareth by *Holinsheds* Cronicle pag. 34. the firſt vſe of Parlament in England was in the tyme of King *Henry* the firſt) it is cleare (I ſay) that the King did not diſcharge and exempt the ſaid Abbot from Iuriſdiction of the Biſhop, nor did graunt vnto the ſaid Abbot Eccleſiaſticall Iuriſdiction within the ſaid Abbey, neyther had that Abbot any Eccleſiaſticall Iuriſdiction deriued from the Crowne: But as it appeareth by the authenticke reporte of the Caſe, the Pope and the King did both ioyne in making the ſaid *Sanctuary*, according vnto their ſeuerall powers & authorityes. So that the exemption from Epiſcopall Iuriſdiction did proceed duely from the graunt of Pope Leo; as likewiſe the exemption from all regall and temporall Iuriſdiction proceed from the Charter of King *Kenulphus*. Note alſo that King *Edwins* grant was only that the ſaid Monaſtery ſhould be free from all earthly ſeruitude, and toucheth not any ſpirituall im-

vvhen Parlamēts beganne in Englād.

muni-

The conclusion of all.

munities, or iurisdiction at all.

90. Thus farre my friend out of England. And by this now yow may see how well *M. Attorney* hath obserued his foresaid protestation, *that he had cyted the very wordes, and textes of the lawes, without any inference, argumēt, or amplification at all.*. And this being my friends aduertisement from England, with like obseruation of many other places cyted by *M. Attorney*, with like fidelity, I thought good to produce this one amongst many (being the first in order) for a taste in this place, reseruing the rest to a fitter, or at leastwise to a second Edition of the foresaid answere of the Catholicke Deuyne, where euery thing may be referred to his due place. And with this will I end both this Chapter and the whole Booke.

THE CONCLVSION OF THE VVHOLE VVORKE,

VVith a briefe exhortation vnto Catholickes, not to vſe the liberty of Equiuocation, *euen in lawfull caſes, but where ſome vrgent occaſion inducеth them therunto.*

CHAP. XIII.

AND now, gentle reader, hauing brought this Treatiſe to an end, and iuſtified (as I hope) our Catholicke doctrine in the eyes and Iudgments of all indifferent men, from the two odious imputations of *Rebellion* and *Equiuocation*, iniuriouſlie caſt vpon the ſame by the malice of *Thomas Morton*; there remayneth nothing, but that I conclude this our ſmall labour, with an exhortation to all Catholicke people, not only to abſtayne from the firſt, which is vtterly vnlawfull (I meane the attempting of any thing con-

trary to their loyall dutyes in ſubiection, be their preſſures neuer ſo great:) but alſo from the practice, and frequent vſe of the ſecond, though in ſome caſes moſt lawfull as abundantly hath byn proued; except ſome vrgent occaſion, or obligation, either of defence of innocency, ſecreſy, right, iuſtice, or the auoyding of open wrong, do force them to the contrary. For as the holy Apoſtle in two ſeuerall places affirmeth to the *Corinthians* in caſes not much vnlike to this about matter of ſcandall: *Omnia mihi licent, ſed non omnia expediunt*: All thinges are lawfull vnto me (touching meates, and other ſuch thinges) but all are not expedient to be practiſed. And againe: *Omnia mihi licent, ſed non omnia edificant*; All things are lawfull vnto me, but all things do not edifye: So I ſay in this caſe, that albeit a man may without breach of truth, or offence of almighty God in certayne caſes, equiuocate, or vſe a doubtfull ſpeach for a good and neceſſary end, either in oath, or out of oath, though the hearer doe not alwayes vnderſtand it, or be deceyued therwith, and that many holy men haue done the ſame, yea Chriſt himſelfe, that is the example, and paterne of all holineſſe and truth in ſpeach, as by many examples before at large hath byn declared: yet conſidering the tymes, and condition therof, wherin Catholicks at this day liue in England, the offence, and ſcandall which Proteſtants, and ſome others, that vnderſtand not the lawfulnes therof, or will not vnderſtand the ſame, do receyue, or raiſe thervpon; my wiſh and counſell to Catholickes ſhould be to vſe the benefit of this liberty moſt ſparingly euen in lawfull thinges, and neuer but vpon great and vrgent cauſes, and occaſions.

Lawfull cauſes of the vſe of Equiuocation.

1. Cor. 6.

1. Cor. 10.

2. And the reaſons of this my wiſh and counſell are principally the two already touched: The one the auoyding of ſcandall euen with the Aduerſary himſelf: and that as Catholicke Religion is the only true in doctrine

The reaſons vvhy Catholickes ought to vſe the li-

doctrine, so the practice also therof in conuersation, should not only be in all truth, and sincerity *re ipsa*, in very deed; but in opinion likewise, and estimation of others, in so much as the word of a Catholicke man ought to weigh more then the oath of an other, and the oath, or promise of a Catholicke, more then any band, or obligation of an other, which for the most parte I doubt not, but is so already taken in England. For that albeit by this doctrine before declared about *Equiuocation*, men do know that Catholickes in certayne cases may vse the same: yet know they also that the said cases are straitly limited with many exceptions, and that in common conuersation, as in buying selling, traffique, and the like, Equiuocation may not be * vsed to the hurte, or preiudice of any man: and that in Iudgments and tribunals, where most vse therof doth fall out, all lawyers, Iudges and Magistrates do know in Catholicke Countryes, wherin the defendant may vse Equiuocation, & wherin not, and consequently truth & Iustice can suffer no wrõg therby. And moreouer they know, as before hath byn said, that the obligation of a Catholicke man, is so great to auoyde all kynd of lyes, whether veniall, or mortall, as for the gayning of a world no one is wittingly and willingly to be committed: which accõpt I doubt whether men of other sectes and Religion do make or noe. So as though already I perswade my self, that Catholicke people stand in good conceipt with all sortes of men, for their truth in concionable and vpright dealing; euen with those which endeauour most in this point to slaunder them: yet would I wish the same to be confirmed more daylie by factes in respect of this new calumniation raysed against them of the liberty of Equiuocation. And this of the first reason.

berty of Equiuocation sparingly.

* *See of these thinges before & namely Cap. 7. Consid. 1.*

3. My other reason is, as before hath byn insinuated,

in regard of the tyme preſent, which being a tyme of tryall & perſecution, requireth at Catholickes hands, a more perfect Confeſsion of their faith, and of all matters belonging thervnto, then at other tymes. And albeit in the former Treatiſe among the Caſes reſerued, wherin *Equiuocation* may not be vſed, confeſsion of faith be expreſly and in the firſt place excepted, ſo as therin no doublenes or doubtfulnes may be vſed: yet no man can deny but many factes and caſes may fall out, concerning matters of Religion not tending to confeſsion (eſpecially in tyme of perſecutiõ) wherin a man may or perhaps alſo muſt by obligation, if otherwiſe he cannot auoyd the wrong & violence that is offred to himſelf or others, vſe Equiuocal ſpeaches, for concealing of that which in conſcience he cannot vtter. But wherſoeuer this obligation is not, there my wiſh is, as now I haue ſaid, that Catholicke people, but eſpecially Prieſtes, whoſe example muſt inſtruct the reſt, ſhould yeald alſo of their right for encreaſe of their merite, and crowne in heauen, and vſe all playneſſe, and ſincerity in ſpeach, and free diſcouering, not only of their religion, but alſo of their ſtate, where it is hurtfull to none, but to themſelues: which yet I ſpeake in that ſenſe, and with that limitation, which the holy Apoſtle did, when he ſaid: *That he gaue counſell of himſelfe, but no precept of our Lord.* And for that this whole Treatiſe of Equiuocation hath proceeded vpõ that queſtion ſo often before repeated, *Whether a Prieſt being taken, may deny himſelfe to be a Prieſt, or no,* I ſhall ſet downe dyuers circumſtances, and conſiderations of the Caſe, wherby alſo ſhal be made more playne, what my meaning is in this behalfe.

Hovv a Prieſt may ſomtymes yeeld of his right vvith more merit.

1. Cor. 7.

4. When a Prieſt commeth firſt into England with full intent and reſolution to offer his life if there be need, for the confeſsion of Catholicke Religion, and is taken afterward, & brought before the Magiſtrate, either

either he is taken in some mans house, of whose ouerthrow he must be the cause if he confesse that he is a priest, or be being taken forth of any house; yet hath he cause to suspect, and perswade himself, that it may be knowne afterward by cõfession of others, that are also taken, or may be taken, that he belongeth to such, or such a house; & in these two cases there is no doubt but that if he thinke, that his denying of himselfe to be a priest, may saue them from hurte, he is bound to deny the same with some kynd of lawfull Equiuocation, but without telling a lye, as * before at large hath byn declared. But if this priest should be taken in the port, as he entreth, or soone after in the high way or otherwise, and brought before a Magistrate, so as his confessing himselfe to be a priest could not preiudice any other, and presupposing that he is vnlawfully demaunded that question, against law, reason, and religion, heere is he at his owne liberty to deny or confesse himselfe to be a priest, and no man can absolutly determine, what were best for him to answere, but the spirite of God that speaketh within him, to whome Christ hath promised to imparte such wisedome, as is necessarie for that tyme and action: yet if he were not a man of such great extraordinary talẽts, as by his losse or restraint, Gods cause were to leese much, or that he were not sure by his denyall to procure his liberty, or that he might iustly doubt that he should quickly come to be knowne in prison, and therby some scandall to arise to the simple, or yll affected by his denyal; In al these Cases I would thinke it more meritorious and of greater perfection and edification to confesse himselfe a priest without further denyall, or declination, which I speake not to condemne them, or their doinges that being taken haue done, or shall do the contrary, for that they vse but their owne right, as hath byn declared; but rather I speake

Diuers cases falling out in the examinatiõ of priests.

* Supra cap. 7. 8. 9. 10.

Luc. 21.

Diuers considerations.

speake it for information of others that may doubt of the Case. Nor do we intend heere to preiudice the most holy doctrine of *S. Athanasius*, and other ancient Fathers of the lawfulnes of flight and escape in persecution, councelled by Christ our Sauiour, and authorized by the example of the Apostles themselues, and namely of *S. Paul*, when he fled, and escaped out of a window, and at an other tyme deluded the enuious pursuite of his enemyes by an Equiuocall speach to the *Pharisies*, and *Saducies*, as before hath byn declared: but rather to shew that cleare confession is somtymes also most commendable, and that in such a tyme of tryall, and of Crownes offred to Catholicks, and especially to Priests for the said confession of the Catholicke faith as now is; no lawfull occasion is to be left for acquiring the same.

Lib. de fuga sua.

Math. 10. Act. 9. 2. Cor. 11.

Act. 23.

5. And this is so much as in this matter I had to aduertise Catholickes in the Conclusion of this my answere, not meaning to discend into further perticulers of actions & obligations that may fall out, which heere are hard to be determined; but only by the present circumstances of the tyme, place, and matter in hand, with regard and respect vnto the two principall vertues that must gouerne vs in these afayres, to witt, *Truth*, and *Iustice*. *Truth*, that all manner of falsity and lying be vtterly auoyded: and *Iustice*, that no iniury be done by vs to Gods cause, our selues, or other men, which is the lawe of a iust man, and true seruant of God, to be obserued, whatsoeuer temporall hurtes, or damages may ensue therof.

The two mayne vertues to be respected, *Truth*, and *Iustice*.

6. And wheras my Aduersary *Thomas Morton*, doth conclude the very last lynes of his booke with a fynall Charge againe renewed of our Antichristian doctrines of lying, and treason, and threatning vs for the same, *not fancyed fyre of Purgatory* (saith he) *as for wood and strawe, but vnquenchable hell-fyre, as for pitch, and tarre, sulphur,*

Conf. pag. 103.

sulphur, and pouder; we shall more charitably conclude with him, wishing that his offences of malice, falsity, and deceipt discouered by vs in this our Answere, *may be wood and straw*, and that the fyre prepared by Gods Iustice for punishing the same may be a purging fyre, and not a consuming fyre, or rather a consuming fyre, and not an vnconsuming fyre, as that is of hell, which he threatneth to vs, but in deed purchaseth to himselfe, by the course he hitherto holdeth.

7. And to this wish and prayer for him, I doubt not but to drawe not only all good, and pious Catholicks that vse it dayly for their enemyes, and persecutors, but the very Iesuites also, against whome he rageth most bitterly, euen in the next precedent lynes before his said conclusion, calling them the *Theologicall Alchimists* of our tyme, that can extract *aurum ex carbone*, and *the Monopolists of all artes* in whome notwithstanding he saith, *no art to be singuler, but that of Equiuocation*, and other such like intertaynments of his vnciuill Vrbanity, wherby he would seeme to his Reader pleasant and ingenious; but in deed maketh himself ridiculous. For that all men know now, or at least wise his Reader will by this our Answere, that the doctrine of *Equiuocation* in certayne Cases, and with due circumstances, is not *Alchimy of the Iesuites*, but the ignorance of *Morton*, and his fellowes, who ascribe that vnto them, as the chife Authors, which was in vse many hundred years before they were in the world. And as for the *Monopolie of artes*, if he vnderstand therby, their teaching aboue others of liberall Artes, and sciences in their schooles throughout Christendome, it is true in a certayne sorte, that this kynd of *Monopolie*, or preeminent labour may be granted vnto their endeauours of their Godly instruction & institution of youth. And happy had it beene for *Tho. Morton*, if he had beene brought vp vnder that *Monopoly*, for it is like he would haue

Mortons scoffs against Iesuits reiected.

had, if not more grace, yet more witt at leaſt and vnderſtanding, then to haue obiected vnto them, as heere he doth, *that no art is ſinguler in them but that of Equiuocation*, wheras the doctrine of *Equiuocation*, as Catholickes hold it, and we before expounded it, is no art, but a ſound poſition in Deuinity, belonging to the direction of a good Conſcience, againſt lying, wherof *Morton* and his fellowes haue ſo learned the art, and confirmed the habit therof by repetition, and multiplication of ſo many actes, as it floweth now from them with as great facility in euery occaſion, as the notes, and tunes of ſinging do from him, that hath made a long habit therin, or as the fingers of a muſition, that without deliberation, or thinking of the player do runne their ſtoppes and performe their perticuler motions by vertue of the habite before made and confirmed.

The facility of lying in T. M. by habit.

8. For proofe of all this I referre my ſelfe to that which hath byn ſet downe in the former Chapters, and eſpecially in the ſixt, and ſo will heere ſhut vp all this Treatiſe, adding only ſome few lynes of aduiſe and admonition, as wel vnto myne Aduerſary, as alſo vnto them whome he by his iniurious and ſlanderous ſycophancy, hath ſought to draw into hatred and danger of the State; and ſo to him I ſay, let him remember what the Iuſtice of God doth menace, and threaten vnto falſe accuſers of their brethren, as haue wrongfully traduced ſo many innocent perſons, as this fellow hath, both in his Epiſtle to the King, and Preface to the Reader, and throughout all his virulēt and ſpitefull Treatiſes, being three or foure in number againſt all ſortes of Catholickes, and the whole body therof, accuſing them of moſt heynous rebellions, and heatheniſh Equiuocations, and for bloodthirſty men, and ſpeakers of lyes without conſcience: and himſelfe (forſooth) *to be a Miniſter of ſimple truth*,

The iniurious behauiour of T. M.

naked

naked innocency, and to hate all lying and equiuocating euen from his very soule. But these things we haue sufficiently I suppose layd open before throughout this worke, and haue shewed him (if I be not deceyued) to be one of the foulest, and most frequent lyers, that euer (perhaps) set pen to paper in these our dayes.

9. And now at this very instant hauing written hitherto, cometh to my handes the Catholicke Treatise it selfe of *Equiuocation* before mẽcyoned, against which *Morton* frameth his answere, and promiseth *A full satisfaction* in the tytle of his booke; of which Treatise not hauing byn able to procure the sight vntill this tyme I fynd so much occasion of new matter giuen therby against the shifting falshood of this Minister, as I might dilate my selfe to the making of a newe Treatise, if I would pursue the particulers of his said deceipts and abuses therin offred. For wheras he professeth *A full answere, and satisfaction*, as hath byn said, which importeth as much, as that he would answere it wholy and truly to the full satisfaction of euery indifferent Reader, he is so farre of from performing that, as he hath not touched, or so much as mencyoned the tenth part therof in his answere, albeit the whole Treatise it selfe be not large, nor conteyneth aboue 8. or 9. sheetes of written paper: nay he doth not so much as name or mencion diuers whole Chapters therin, and those which he doth touch, he doth it with such art and subtility, skipping hither, and thither, forth and backe, at length, and crosse-wise, taking heere a sentence, and there an other, as though his principall care had byn not to be vnderstood, or at leastwise not to be found out where he walketh, wherof I shall giue heere some short tast, or note, as it were, with the finger, wherby the rest may be coniectured. Stand attent then gentle Reader, and marke his manner of answering.

The Catholicke Treatise of Equiuocation commeth to sight.

A note vpon the Anſvvere of T. M. to the Catholicke Treatiſe of Equiuocation.

10. Firſt then to begin his confutation *pag.* 48. he layeth hands on the firſt wordes or tytle of the Preface, alledging therof ſix lynes for his purpoſe, as for the ground of his whole workmanſhip, and then in the ſame page he ſteppeth from the Preface to the fifth Chapter of the *Treatiſe*, and taketh thence three lynes: then *pag.* 53. he recoyleth backe to the ſecond Chapter cyting ſeuen lynes from thence: & *pag.* 55. he aduaunceth himſelfe forward againe to the third Chapter, and produceth an eleuen lynes: and then in the very next leafe in two ſeuerall tymes he draweth from the ſame Chapter ſome 9. lynes; and after ſome ten pages of ſilence, cyteth 4. lynes more from the ſaid third Chapter of his Aduerſaryes Treatiſe, from whence preſently in the next leafe *pag.* 70. he giueth a large leape to fetch 3. lynes out of the tenth Chapter, which is the laſt of all, and from thence in the next leafe *pag.* 72. he runneth backe againe to the 4. Chapter, and alleageth but 7. lynes only: & *pag.* 73. fiue lynes more; & *pag.* 78. 7. lynes more out of the ſaid 4. Chapter: and then geuing a ſtryde to the 8. Chapter *pag.* 80. he bringeth thence ſome 2. lynes to worke vpon; then *pag* 85. giueth a skipp backe to the 4. and 7. Chapters and out of them both draweth ſome 6. or 7. lynes towards his buylding; and from hence againe *pag* 88. he ſtretcheth himſelfe to the tenth Chapter for ſome 3. or 4. lynes to helpe himſelfe withall; and *pag.* 93. and 99. for ſome 9. or 10. lynes more, and with thus endeth his whole anſwere.

A conſideration vpō Mortons methode of anſvvering.

11. And now conſider prudent Reader what manner of *full ſatisfaction* this is, that in ſo little a Treatiſe leaueth out ſo principall partes vnanſwered, as that of ten Chapters he omitteth wholy three without mencion therof, which are the firſt, ſixth, and ninth Chapters, and then in the other examineth the matter ſo ſlenderly, as that out of the whole fifth Chapter he hand-

handleth only three lynes, & out of the 7. ſcarſe other three, and out of the ſecond, but ſeauen, and none of all theſe Chapters are handled by him either in order or methode as they lye, or as they haue connexion togeather by deſignement of the Author; but with skypping and leaping hither and thither, as hath byn ſhewed. And the chiefe and principall points therof, which are very learnedly hãdled by his Aduerſary, are either left out, and ſuppreſſed, or ſo weakly touched, the difficultyes alſo ſo diſſembled, and the reaſons and authorityes alleadged by his Aduerſary ſo omitted or concealed, as a man may ſee that the Miniſter durſt not in deed come within the lyſtes of lawfull combat, though as before yow haue heard he vaunted greatly that he would.

12. And by this yow may take ſome ſcantling of *Thomas Mortons* worth, what it is, without further entrance into particulers of this Treatiſe, which are ouer long for this place. If he reply, we may then perhaps examine the matter more largely. Now I will conclude with him only with that admonition before mentioned, that he conſider how odious a matter it is, both in the ſight of God and man, to be ſo publicke a calumniator of his brethren, as he hath ſhewed himſelf to be.

13. And as for the Catholickes againſt whom his calumniations are, ſmal exhortation may ſerue to beare it patiently, and make their benefit of it, for ſo much as all the whole ſtreme of holy Scriptures, & exhortations of the holy ghoſt doth runne aboue all other pointes to this end to comfort godly men in this caſe, when lying lippes, wicked tongues, ſlaũderous pennes opprobrious calumniations, and ſpitefull contumelyes do moſt inſult againſt them. For then is properly that tyme, and occaſion wherof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh: *Cùm id quod in præſenti eſt momentaneum, & leue tribulationis* 2. Cor. 4.

To the Catholickes.

noſtra, ſupra modum in ſublimitate æternum gloriæ pondus operatur. When that which in this preſent mortall life, is but momentary and light tribulation (*for what is more light and momentary then the darts of wicked tongues, that paſſe with the wynd?*) doth worke notwithſtanding (*being patiently borne*) an eternall weight of glory in heauen: Whervnto almighty God bring vs all, and our enemyes alſo, if it be his holy wil.

Faultes eſcaped in the Printing.

Page	*Line*	*fault*	*Correction.*
25.	20.	*my*	his.
74.	13.	*priſon*	poyſon.
82.	1.	*Reipublicæ*	Reſpublica.
168.	4.	*our manner*	our name.
225.	18.	*aſſert*	aſſent.
252.	15.	*Faciendum*	Fatendum.
276.	30.	*dele*	way.
311.	28.	*ſiſted*	foiſted.
317.	28.	*adde*	dicitur.
385.	32.	*hominem*	hominum.
396.	in titulo	*lege*	defend.
414.	25.	*refuge*	refuſe.
436.	16.	*Iſues*	lyes.
445.	4.	*is true*	is not true.
486.	16.	*a be*	to be.
497.	29.	*aule*	rule.

Other leſſer faultes, it may pleaſe the gentle Reader himſelfe of courteſy to correct.

A TABLE.

Faultes escaped in the Printing.

Page	Line	Fault	Correction.
27.	10.	my	his.
74.	13.	pryson	poyson.
82.	1.	Respublica	Reipublica.
168.	4.	our manner	our name.
225.	18.	assert	assent.
252.	5.	Faciendum	Fatendum.
276.	30.	date	way.
311.	18.	fained	foisted.
317.	23.	addit	dicitur.
385.	32.	hominem	hominum.
396.	in circulo	lege	defend.
414.	25.	refuge	refute.
436.	16.	lines	lyes.
447.	4.	is true	is not true.
486.	16.	a fee	to be.
497.	29.	mule	rule.

Other lesser faultes, it may please the gentle Reader himselfe of courtesy to correct.

A TABLE.

A TABLE
OF THE
PARTICVLAR MATTERS
CONTEYNED
IN THIS BOOKE:

A

ADRIAN the fourth Pope, an englishmā by byrth, *cap.* 2. *nu* 46. Egregiously abused by Thom. Morton, *ibid.*

Adultery vvhen and hovv it may be concealed by Equiuocation. *cap.*20.*nu.*37.

Alexāder Halensis his rigour against lying.*cap.*7.*nu.*40.

S. Ambrose abused and his text imbezeled by T.M. *cap.*6.*n.*17.

Amphibology how it differeth from Equiuocation.*cap.*8.*n.*10.

Ananias and *Saphyra* their fact discussed.*cap.*11.*n.*28.& 29.

S. Anselme his distinction betwene Truth and Falsity, *cap.*8. *num.*46.

Approuers of Equiuocation in certaine cases, who they be? *cap.*7.*n.*12.& *cap.* 10. *num.*15. Their qualities and holynesse of lyfe.*ibid n.*16.& 17. & *cap.*9. *n.*11.12.13.& *deinceps.*

Archbishop of *Canterbury* his testimony of the Primitiue English *Genetians*, *cap.* 1. *n.* 19.

Archisynagoges daughter raised by Christ,*cap.*9. *nu.*28.

Aristotle his definition of Equiuocation,*ca.*8. *n.*4.5.6.& 7.

Aristotle Thomas Mortons Oracle of Logitians, *cap.*8.*n.*6. Abused by him afterward,*ibid. n.*5.6.7. *& deinceps in aliis locis.*

Arrianisme whether fauoured by Caluin or noe,*cap.*6. *part.*3. per totum.

Diuers *Arrian* speaches vsed by Caluin, *ibidem nu.*77.

S. Augustines definitiō of *Catholicum*, *Prefat.n.*16.

His moderation about Hereticks,

tiks, and their belieuers, *cap.*2. *n.*18.
His seuere sentẽce against them *ibidem nu.*54.
His explication about heresy consummated in the vnderstãding and not in the will, *cap.*6. *n.* 45.
His definition of Truth, *cap.* 8. *nu.*40. Item of a lye, *ibid.n.*47.
His authority alleadged by F. *Garnet* at his arraignement for the lawfullnes of Equiuocatiõ, *cap.*9.*n.*52.& 54.
His further authority for Equiuocation, *cap.*10.*n.*17.
His case about a sickeman, *cap.* 11.*n.*31.
Abused notably by *M. Ievvell*, *cap.*12.*n.*30.& 31. & 34.
Authors discourse against Cathol. without name or truth of argument, *Prefat.n.*13.14.& 15.
Azor the Iesuite falsified and corrupted by Thom. Morton. *cap.*6.*n.*48.& *cap.*11.*n.*18.
His discours about Equiuocation in an oath. *cap.*10.*n.*29.

B

D. BARKELEY his writings against Protestants *cap.*5.*nu.*30.
Bellarmine notably abused by the Minister Morton. *cap.*6. *n.*27.28.& 71.& *alibi sæpe.*
S. Bernard abused by Perkins *cap.*12.*n.*61.62.& 63.
Betulia deliuered by the stratageme of *Iudith*, *cap.*7.*n.*27.
Bishop of *Geneua* somtymes temporal Lord also of that City. *cap.*4.*n.*43.
Bookes writen by Protestants without name of Author or truth, *Prefat.n.*13.14.& 15.
S. *Boniface* an Englishman, Author of the Canon *Si Papa. cap.*5.*n.*55.
Falsified and abused by Tho. Morton, *ibid.*43.
D. Boucher calumniated and abused by T. Morton, *cap.*2.*n.* 24.& 47.
Buckanan & *Knox* their wicked doctrine & reuell in Scotland, *cap.*4. *n.*24.

C

CALVIN whether he denyed Christ to be God of God, *cap.*6.*n.*53.
His manner of speach therin condemned by Bellarmine, *ibidem*, *n.*56.76.& 77.
VVhether he fauoured *Arrianisme*, or noe? *cap.* 6. *part.*3. *per totum.*
Diuers *Arrian* speaches vsed by him, *ibidem n* 77.
His inuectiue against the Ancient Fathers, *cap.*12.*n.*23.
Caluinian doctrine about obedience to Princes, *cap.*1.*n.*10. 11.12. *& postea.*
The practice therof by Protestants, *ibidem.*
Carerius a Lawyer abused egregiously by Th. Morton. *cap.* 5.*n.*5.6.7. & *cap.*6.*n.*90.
Cassander the hereticke his doctrine confuted, *cap.*6.*n.*67.
Cases particuler of Equiuocation, *cap.*20.*per totum.*

Catho-

Catholicks tolerable in a Proteſtant ſtate, *cap.*1.*per totum.*

Cauſe of ſetting forth this preſent booke. *cap.* 3.*per totum.*

Celeſtinus Pope abuſed by *M. Iewell*, *cap.* 12. *n.* 41.

Cenſure of Thomas Mortons writings, *cap.*3.*n.*17.

Charge of the Lord Cook againſt Catholicks at *Norwich*, *cap.*12. *n.*79.& 80.

Charge of hereſy againſt Proteſtants by their owne ſide, *cap.* 4.*n.*11.

Charke and *Hanmer* their Equiuocations, *cap.*12.*n.*55.& 56. *& deinceps.*

Their Bookes againſt *F. Campian*, *ibidem.*

Charter of *K. Kenulphus* falſified by the Lord Cooke, *cap.* 12. *n.*81. 82. *& deineeps.*

Choyſe or election maketh hereſy, *cap.*2.*n.*20.

Chriſt his tẽporall Kingdome, *cap.*5.*n.*18.

Chriſt how he is our Iudge, and how not, *cap.*8.*n.*26.

How he did feigne to go further then the caſtle of *Emaus*, *cap.*9.n.*n.*8.72. & 73.

His denyall to aſcend to the feſtiuall day, *ibid.n.*59.

Cicero his doubtfull anſwers, *cap.*9.*n.*33.& 34.

Commotion of *VVales* anno 1605. and for what cauſe, *Pref. n.* 7.& 8.

Compariſon betwene the diſobedience of Catholickes and Proteſtants, *cap.*1.*n.*17.

Conference betwene two ſhameleſſe Miniſters. *cap.*4. *n.*47.

Confeſſion and the ſecret therof, *cap.*10.*n.* 2.& 3.

Equiuocation lawfull for not reueaIing matters heard in *Cõfeſſion*, *ibidem.*

Conſent of Emperours neceſſary for gathering of Councels in oldtyme, & why, *cap.*6.*n.*33.

Contention about the expulſion of *K. Ozias* of *Iſraell*, *cap.*6. *n.* 8. 9. 10.& 11.

Contumacy defined by *Sayer* the *Benedictine*, *cap.*6.*nu.*51.

Couẽtry caſe about the plague *cap.*10.*n.*31.

B. Cunerus abuſed by *Thomas Morton*, *cap.*6.*n.*47.59.

D

DAVID Q. Maries Secretary of Scotland murdered, *cap.*1.*n.*21.

Definitiõ of Cõtumacy, *c.*6.*n.*6

Definition of Truth by *S. Auguſtine*, *cap.*8.*n.*40.

Item of a lye, *ibidem nu.*47.

Depoſition of Princes by the liuely word of God, *cap.*4.*n.*34

Deuinity deducted from age to age, *cap.*9.*n.*5.

Increaſe therof, *ibidem uu.*6.

Schoole-Deuinity & poſitiue their beginninges, *ibid.nu.*7.

Deuinity ſpeculatiue and morall. *ibid.n.*8.

Difference of contumacy and pertinacy, *cap.*6.*n.*52.

Diſagreement betwene Proteſtants & Caluiniſts, *cap.*2.n.13.

Dignity of Prieſthood aboue Regalty, *cap.*5.*n.*4.5.*& deinceps n.*10.11.& 12.

Diſcourſe againſt Catholicks

without name of Author or truth. *Prefat, n.* 13.

Diſobedience cõpared betwene Catholicks and Proteſtãts, *cap.* 1. *n.* 27.

Diſputation of *Pleſſis Mornay* with the Bishop of *Eureux*, *cap.* 12. *n.* 53. & 54.

Diſſimulation when it is lawfull and when not, *cap.* 11. *n.* 17.

Doctrine and practice of rebellion whether more in Catholickes than Proteſtants, *cap.* 1. *n.* 7. 8. 9. *& deinceps.*

Dolman author of the *Succeſſion* egregiouſly abuſed by *Th. Morton*, *cap.* 2 *n.* 23. 34. & 35.

E

ECCLESIASTICALL Supremacy in temporall cauſes, how it is to be vnderſtood, *c.* 6. *n.* 22.

Syr Edvvard Cooke his booke of reportes againſt Catholicks, *Pref. n.* 9. & 10.

His Paradox of Engliſh Kings, *ibidem.*

His falſe and odious aſſertions againſt Catholicks, *ibid. n.* 11.

His Equiuocations, *ca.* 12 *n.* 77. *vſque ad finem capitis.*

His notable fiction againſt *Pius Quintus*, *ibid n.* 78.

His Charge againſt Catholicks at *Norvvich*, *ibid. n.* 79.

Emperours conſent neceſſary for gathering of Conncells in old tyme, and why, *cap.* 6. *n.* 33.

England her pittifull ſtate at this day *Prefat. n.* 2.

Equity of Catholike doctrine tryed by the effects, *cap* 4 *n.* 13.

Equiuocation & the doctrine therof, how and when it is lawfull, *cap.* 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. & 12. *per totum.*

How the ſame is defended, *ibi. cap.* 7. *n.* 2. 3. 4.

The vſe therof receyued for 400. yeares. *ibid. n.* 8. 9. 10. 11. *& deinceps.*

The neceſsity therof in certain caſes, *ibid. n.* 20. 21. *& deinceps.*

Equiuocation vſed by *S. Paul*, *cap.* 7. *n.* 51, *& alibi in diuerſis locis.*

Equiuocation what it is, *cap.* 8. *per totum.*

Equiuocation of two ſorts. *ibi. num.* 2.

The definition therof by Ariſtotle, *ibid. n.* 5. 6. & 7.

How it differeth from Amphibology, *ibid. n.* 10.

Equiuocation mentall & verball, *cap.* 8. *n.* 3. & 12.

Equiuocation defended by all foraine Cath. writers, *cap.* 9 *n.* 11. 12. 13. *& deinceps.* & cap. 10. *n.* 15.

Equiuocation by reaſon and inſtinct of nature, *cap.* 9. *n.* 81.

Equiuocation preiudiciall to common conuerſation, *cap.* 10. *num* 23.

Equiuocation in an oath, how and when it is lawfull, *cap.* 10. *n.* 29. & 30.

Equiuocation in Proteſtantes ſtarke lying, *cap.* 12. *per totum.*

Equiuocall and ambiguous ſpeaches of our Sauiour, *cap.* 8. *n.* 13. & 14. & cap. 9. *n.* 26. 27. 28. & 61.

Examples of falſe dealing of Thomas

Thomas Morton, *cap.* 6.7.8.9. 10.11.& 12. *per totum.*

Exasperations in Englād what they cause. *Prefat. per totam.*

The inconueniences that ensue therby, *ibidem.*

Exemption of Clergy-men & Th. Mortons notorious false dealing therin, *cap.* 6.*n.* 13. 14. 15. *& deinceps.*

Experience of tyme a good proofe, *cap.* 7.*n.* 9.

Extrauagant of *Pope Boniface* the eight falsified by Th. Morton, *cap,* 6.*n.* 43.

F

MY FATHER *is Greater then I*, hovv ancient Fathers do vnderstād the same, *cap.* 6.*n.* 100. & 101.

Footinges of Protestants in periodes of antiquity, *c.* 5.*n.* 40.

Fox his huge volume of *Actes* and *Monumentes*, *cap.* 12. *n.* 48. Hovv he is called the Father of lyes, *Ibid.* The same confuted, *Ibid. n.* 50. & 52.

Syr *Francis Hastinges* his Equiuocations, *cap.* 12.*n.* 66. 67. 68. *& deinceps.*

His vvilfull vntruth about the poysoning of K. *Iohn. Ibid.* His abuse of S. *Hierome, Ibid n.* 69.

Fraud and *Fallacy* vvhat they be, *cap.* 8.*n.* 48.49. *& deinceps.*

Fraud and deceipt of *Thomas Morton* in alleaging all sortes of Authors, *cap.* 2. *n.* 23. & 24. *& cap.* 5.*nu.* 5.6.7. *&* 49. *&* 53. *& per totum* Caput Sextum, *& deinceps per totum librum.*

G

F. GARNET his alleadging *S. Augustine* for the lavvfulnes of Equiuocatiō, at his arraignment, *cap.* 9.*n.* 52. & 54.

Genesius Sepulueda his opinion of Equiuocation, *cap.* 9. *n.* 57. Abused notably by *Tho. Morton. Ibidem.*

Giges-ringe one of Thomas Mortons signes, *cap.* 11. *n.* 39.

Gilby the Minister his doctrine and immodest speach of K. *Henry* the 8. *cap.* 4. *n.* 35.

George Cassander vvhat he vvas and his doctrine. *cap.* 6. *n.* 69. The same condemned by Englisn Protestātes. *Ibid.n.* 69. & 70.

God cannot deceaue or cooperate to an vntruth, *cap.* 7. *n.* 38.

God hovv he permitteth men to be deceyued, *cap.* 8. *n.* 54. & *cap.* 9. *n.* 77.

Gods Ordination oftentymes ioyned vvith his permission, *cap.* 9. *n.* 78.

Goodman, and other Englisn Protestantes of *Geneua* their doctrine, *cap.* 4.*n.* 16.17. & 34.

Gratian Collector of the *Canon-lavv*, *cap.* 9. *n.* 9.

Gratians text corrupted and falsifyed by Thomas, Morton, *cap.* 2. *n.* 49. & 52.

S. *Gregory* his authority for the lavvfulnes of Equiuocatiō, *cap.* 10. *n.* 18.

Gregory de Valētia his Charge

againſt Caluin for Arrianiſme, *cap.* 6. *n.* 78.
His authority for Equiuocation, *cap.* 10. *n.* 16.

H

HAMMOND his booke of the Cõmotion of Papiſtes in *Herefordſhire an.* 1605. *Pref. n.* 7.
Hanmer and *Charke* their bookes againſt F. Campian, *cap.* 12. *n.* 55.
Their Equiuocations. *Ibidem. n.* 56. & 57. *& deinceps.*
Hannibalis ten priſoners their caſe ſet dovvne by *Cicero*, *cap.* 11. *n.* 33.
Heape of falſityes togeather committed by Thomas Morton. *cap.* 5. *n.* 57. & 58.
Henry the fourth Emperour his ſubmiſſion to Pope *Hildebrand* at *Canuſium*, *cap.* 6. *n.* 38.
K. *Henry* the 8. of England his Supremacy impugned by diuers Proteſtantes, cap. 4. *n.* 35.
Hereſy vvhat it is, *cap.* 2. *n.* 19.
Who is an hereticke, *Ib. n.* 20.
Hereſy conſummated in the vnderſtanding and not in the vvill, *cap.* 6. *n.* 44.
Hereſy cannot be decreed in the Cath. Church by Popes, as Popes. *cap.* 6. *n.* 63.
M. Horne his Equiuocations, *cap.* 12. *n.* 43.
D. Hunnius his booke againſt Caluin, *cap.* 6. *n.* 78. 80. His proteſtation and prayer againſt Caluiniſtes, *Ibid. n.* 98.
His opinion about Caluins vvryting againſt Arrians, *Ibid. n.* 103.

I

IACOB vvhether he lyed or noe in ſaying he vvas *Eſau*, *cap.* 9. *n.* 34.
B. Ianſenius his diſcourſe about the feigning of our Sauiour to goe further then *Emaus*, *cap.* 9. *nu.* 73.
Ievvell Biſhop of *Salisbury* his notable lying-Equiuocation, *cap.* 12. *nu.* 12. 13. 14. & *deinceps.*
His abuſing & rayling againſt *S. Auguſtine*, *Ibid. n.* 30. 31. & 34.
His Apoſtrophe in his ſermon at Paules Croſſe, *Ibid. n.* 12.
Impiety of *Porphyrius* the Apoſtata, *cap.* 9. *n.* 66.
Incertainty of Saluation dependeth on our partes, *cap.* 11. *n.* 24.
Inconuenientes of exaſperation and deſpayre, *cap.* 1. *nu.* 3.
Inſolencies vſed tovvardes K. *Iames* of England by Proteteſtant-Miniſters in Scotland, *cap.* 1. *n.* 24.
Inſurrections againſt lavvfull Princes by New-Ghoſpellers in our dayes, *cap.* 1. *n.* 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. & *deinceps.*
Intention to deceyue, a principall clauſe in a lye, *cap.* 8. *nu.* 47. & 56.
S. Iohn Baptiſt his mentall Reſeruation, *cap.* 9. *n.* 18. 19. 20. & 21.
His anſvvere compared to the anſvvere of a prieſt in Englãd, *cap.* 9.

cap.9.n.23. & 24.

Iohn Caluin vvhether he fauoured Arrianiſme or no? *cap. 6. part. 3. per totum.* His diuers Arrian ſpeaches, *Ibid. n. 77.*

Whether he denyed Chriſt to be *God of God, Ibid.n. 53.*

His manner of ſpeach condemned by *Bellarmine, Ibid.n. 56. 76. & 77.*

His extreeme pride and impiety, *cap. 6. n. 97.*

Whether, and hovv he impugned the Arrians, *cap. 6. n. 102.*

Ioſue his ſtratageme in taking the Citty of Hay by Gods appointment, *cap.7.n.25.*

Ironicall ſpeach a kind of Equiuocation, *cap.8. n. 16.*

K

KING *Kenulphus* his charter for Abindon-Monaſtery notably falſified by the Lord *Cooke, cap.12. n. 81. 82. & deinceps.*

Keyes hovv they may ſignify authority both temporall and ſpirituall, *cap. 5. n. 37.*

King Iames of Great-Brittany his ſpeach in his Proclamation & Court of Parlamēt, *Prefat. n.16.*

His moderation therin. *ibidem.*

His affliction and moleſtation by Proteſtants in Scotland, *cap. 1.n.23.24. &25.*

His iudgement of Engliſh miniſters notes vpon the Bible, *cap. 4. n. 25.*

Kingly power or Prieſthood in Chriſt whether greater, *cap. 5. n. 10. 11. 12. 13. & 14.*

Knox his peſtilent and wicked doctrine againſt the ſoueraignty of Princes. *cap.2. n.48.*

His Reuel and cruelty in Scotland againſt Catholicks. *cap. 4. n.24. & 33.*

L

LAMBERTVS *Scaſnaburgenſis* abuſed by Thomas Morton, *cap.6. n.37.*

S. Leo notably corrupted by Thomas Morton, *cap. 6. n. 19. 20. &21.*

Lord of *Salisbury* his booke and anſwere to a threatning letter ſent him *anno* 1605. *Pref. n.18. & 19.*

The ſcope therof, *ibid.n.20.21. 22. &23.*

How he was deceyued by his Deuyne, *ibid.n.20. & 21.*

Luthers wicked opinion of the ancient Fathers when they make againſt him, *cap. 12.n. 21. 22. & 23.*

Lying and diſsimulation hovv different from Equiuocation. *cap.7.n.34.*

S. Thomas his ſeuerity againſt lying, *ibid. n.35.*

Item of the Maiſter of Sentēces *ibid.n.36.*

Lying defined by *S. Auguſtine, cap.8.n.47.*

The eſſence therof, *ibidem.*

Item by S. Thomas of Aquin, *ibid n, 56, & 57.*

MAR-

M

MARTINVS *de Magistris* abused by *M. Ievvell, cap.* 12.*n.*36.

Mentall reseruation proued in S. Iohn Baptiste his answere, *cap.*9.*n.*18.& 19.

Ancient Fathers their exposi-tions for the same, *ibid. nu.*20. & 21.

Mentall reseruation in diuers speaches of our Sauiour. *cap.*8. *n.*13.14. & *cap.* 9. *n.* 26. 27. 28. & 44. & 58. 59. 61. & *cap.* 11. *num.* 45.

Metropolitan of lying Metropolis, *cap.*10.*n.*33.

Miters how they be aboue Crownes, *cap.*5. *n.*25.

Murder of the *Lord Darley* K. of Scotland by Protestants, *cap.*1.*n.*21.

Murder of *Dauid* Secretary to the Q. of Scotland, *cap.*1.*n. Ibid.*

Mysterious speaches how they be Equiuocall, *cap.*9.*n.*35.

N

NATVRE of heresy and pertinacy, *c.* 6.*n.*41.

Necessity of Equiuocation in some cases, *cap.*7.*n.*20.21.22. & *deinceps.*

Necessity not required to perfection in many thinges, *cap.*7. *nu.* 5.

O

OATH vvhat it is, *cap.* 8. *num.* 50.

Oath of Supremacy in Englād and T.M. his iudgment therof, *cap.* 6. *n.* 24.

Obedience to Princes and doctrine therof deliuered by Caluinistes, *cap.* 1. *n.* 10.

Obstinacy necessary to make heresy, and vvhy? *cap.*6 *n.* 43.

Offers, and kind *Offices* of the Sea of *Rome*, tovvards K. *Iames* of Great Brittany, *cap.*2.*n.*41.

Old-Testament a figure of the nevv, *cap.* 5. *num.* 6.

Opinion of Catholickes for restrayning of euill Princes, *cap.* 5. *n* 45.

Opinion of forraine vvryters for the lavvfulnesse of Equiuocation, *cap.* 10.*num.* 15.

Oracle of Logitians, *cap.* 8. *num.* 6.

Orders of Religious men that defend Equiuocation, *cap.* 9. *num.* 14.

Otho Frisingensis abused by *T. Morton*, *cap.* 8.*num.*36.

Ozias King of Israell his expulsion, and contention therabout, *cap.*6. *n.* 8. 9. 10. & 11.

P

PARLAMENTES their first beginning in Englād, *cap.* 12. *num.* 89.

Perfection requireth not necessity in many thinges, *c.*7.*n.*5.

Perkins

Perkins the Minister his equiuocations, *cap*, 12. *n*. 58. 59. 60. & *deinceps*.
His falsifying of *S. Bernard*, *ibid. n*. 60. 61. & 62.
Plessis Mornay his Equiuocations, *cap*. 12. *n*. 72. 73. &c.
His disputation with the Bishop of *Eureux* in France, *ibid. n*. 74. 75.
His falsifying of Authors, *ibid.*
Ponderations about the vncertainty of Protestants doctrine, *cap*. 6 *part*. 3. §. 4. *per totum*.
Popes may and must be deposed for heresy. *cap*. 5. *n*. 53. & *cap*. 6. *n*. 62. & 63.
Pope lesse dangerous without Superior, then many Princes, *cap*. 5. *n*. 61.
Pope Pius Quintus abused by the Lord Cooke, *cap*. 12. *n*. 78.
Pope Hildebrand slaundered by Th. M. *cap*. 6. *n*. 33. & 34.
The Emperours submissiõ vnto him at *Canusium*, *ibidem*.
Porphyrius the Apostata his impiety, *cap*. 9. *n*. 66.
Princes how they must deposed by the liuely word of God, *cap*. 4. *n*. 34.
Prior Iames of Scotland made Earle of *Murrey*, and Lord Protector of that Kingdome, *cap*. 1. *n*. 20. & 21.
Priesthood & the dignity therof greater then Regalty, *cap*. 5. *n*. 32. & 33.
Two principall points therof, *ibid. n*. 17.
Priesthood and Kingly power in Christ whether greater on earth, *cap*. 5. *n*. 10. 11. 12. 13. & 14.
Prooses for the lawfullnes of Equiuocation, *cap*. 9. *per totum*.
Prophesyes corrupted and eluded by *Iohn Caluin*, *c*. 6. *part*. 3. §. 3. *per totum*.
Propositions reserued, how they be equiuocall, and how not, *cap*. 11. *n*. 14.
Protestants their bookes and writinges against Caluinistes, *cap*. 2. *n*. 12. 13. & *deinceps*.
Protestant-Princes many of them neuer molested by the Pope. *cap*. 2. *n*. 40. & cap. 3. *n*. 3.
Protestant-People more perillous then Popes. *cap*. 2. *n*. 44.
Protestantes in what cases they may be subiect to the penaltyes of heresyes; *cap*. 3. *n*. 9.
Protestants charged with heresie by men of their owne profession, *cap*. 3 *n*. 12. & *cap*. 4. *n*. 5. 6. 7. 8. & 9.
Protestants footings in periods of Antiquity, *cap*. 5 *n*. 40.
Puritans condemned by Protestants and Protestants by them, *cap*. 4. *n*. 9.

Q

QVEENE *Maries* of Scotland mother & daughter their afflictions by Protestants *cap* 1. *n*. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. & 23.
Queene Mary of England her gouernmẽt impugned by Protestants, *cap*. 4. *n*. 28. 29. & 30.
The conspiracy of Syr Thom. VViat against her, *ibid. n*. 37.
Queene Elizabeth her gouernment cõtradicted by some Protestants at the beginning. *cap*. 4. *n*. 25.

Quality and holyneſſe of ſuch men as haue admitted the vſe of equiuocation for lavvfull, *cap.*7.*n.*16. & 17.

R

REBELLION & doctrine of Proteſtants about the practice therof, *cap.*1.*n.*6.

Rebellions againſt Q. *Marie* of England how they be anſvvered by Tho. Morton, *cap.* 4.*n.*29.30.31.& 32.

Rebellions in Flaunders and Germany by Proteſtãts againſt their lawfull Princes, *cap.*4.*n.* 48.50.51.& 52.

Reſeruations mentall in Chriſtes ſpeach, *cap.* 8.*n.*13. & 14. & *cap.*9.*n.*26. 27. 28. & 44.

Circumſtances neceſſary to find out mentall reſeruations, *ibidem.*

Reſeruations mentall in Saint Iohn Baptiſt, *ibidem* nu. 18.19. & 20.

M. Reynoldes boke of *Caluino-Turciſmus. cap.*2.*n.*6.

His collectiõ of moderne hereſyes, *ibid.n.*8.

Abuſed by Th. Morton, *ibidem num.*27.

Royardus the Franciſcan abuſed by Th. Morton, *cap.*7.*n.*59.

S

SACRIFICE of Chriſtians ceaſed in Alexandria, *cap.*6.*n.*20.

Salmeron the Ieſuite egregiouſly abuſed by Tho. Morton, *cap.*5.*n.*7.& *cap.*6.*n.*4.

Sayer the Benedictine falſified and corrupted by. Th. Morton *cap.*6.*n.*50.& 51.

His Diſcourſe about Equiuocation in an oath. *cap.* 10. *n.*30.

Scarres of infirmity in Tho. Morton, *cap.*9.*n.*39.

Scottiſh-Miniſters their abſurd poſitions & doctrine. *c.*4.*n.*23.

Secretary David barbarouſly murdered in Scotland, *cap.* 1. *num.*21.

Secret of confeſſiion, *cap.* 10. *n.*2.3.& 4.

Secretes of the Cõmon-welth, *ibidem, n.*6.& 7.

How Equiuocatiõ may be lawfull in defenſe therof, *ibid.n.*8.

Sheep-byters not tolerable in a Common-welth, *cap.*1.*n.*4.

Sociablylity in doctrine vvith Proteſtants not ſufferable. *cap.* 2.*n.*5.

Sotus the Deuyne abuſed and falſified by Th. Morton, *cap.*10. *nu.*34.35.& 36.

D. Stapleton abuſed by Tho. M. *cap.*2.*n.*25.

Stratageme of Ioſue in taking the Citty of Hay, *cap.*7.*n.*25.

Alſo of Eliſeus the Prophet, *ibidem, n.*26.

Of Iudith in ſleaing *Holofernes ibid.n.*27.

Supremacy impugned by diuers Proteſtants in the beginning and vvhy? *cap.* 4.n.36.

Sutcliffe Deane of Exceſter and his notable ſhifting, *cap.*4. *n.*9.& 10.

His

His teſtimony of Proteſtants doctrine for depoſing of Princes, *ibid. n.* 44.
His full and round Anſvvere to the Three Cõuerſions of England, hovv vaine and impertinent, *cap.* 5. *n.* 54.

T

S. THOMAS of Aquin his ſeuere ſentence againſt lying, *cap.* 7. *n.* 35. Alledged by T. M. againſt himſelfe, *cap.* 11. *num.* 56.
Syr *Thomas VViat* his pretence againſt Queene Mary, *cap.* 4. *num.* 37.
Thomas Morton his booke againſt Romiſh doctrine, *Pref. nu.* 12.
His maine drift and ſeditious ſcope therin, *cap.* 1. *nu* 1. 2. 3. & *deinceps.*
The ſame confuted, *Ibid.* & *alibi ſapè.*
His reaſons againſt the diſloyalty of Catholickes confuted, *cap.* 2. *per totum.*
His egregious abuſing of all ſortes of Authors, ſacred and prophane, *cap.* 2. *nu.* 23. 24. & 28. & *cap.* 5. *num.* 5. 6. 7. & *nu.* 49. & *per totum libru deinceps.*
A Catalogue of his corruptiõs *cap.* 2. *n.* 57. & *cap.* 5. *nu.* 57.
His lending and borrovving of the Lord Cooke, *cap.* 3. *n.* 2.
His fond floriſhes, *Ibidem. n.* 5. & *per totum librum.*
His bad protectorſhippe of Proteſtantes, *cap.* 3. *nu.* 13.
His ſilly deuiſe of flattery about the depoſition of Kinges, *cap.* 4. *nu.* 26, & 27.
Thomas Morton not able to defend his Religion from hereſy againſt his ovvne Proteſtant brethren, *cap.* 4. *num.* 12.
His Treatiſe of the *Popes Supremacy* as head of Rebelliõ, confuted, *cap.* 5. *per totum.*
His great hypocriſy, *cap.* 5. *num.* 50. & *vbique deinceps.*
His impudency, *Ibid. num.* 58.
His impertinent Reaſons confuted, *cap.* 2. *per totum.* & *cap.* 5. *num.* 59.
His conceipt of the Oath of Supremacy in England, *cap.* 6. *n.* 24. & 25.
His notable abuſe of Cardinall Bellarmine, *cap.* 6. *n.* 27. & 28.
Item the like of Cardinall Tolet, *Ibid. nu.* 49. & alibi.
His ten lyes at a clap, *c.* 6. *n.* 64.
His Oracle of Logitiãs, *cap.* 8. *num.* 6.
His deteſtation of Equiuocation, but not of lying, *cap.* 8. *num.* 20.
His Socraticall demaundes, *ca.* 9. *num.* 22.
His ſcarres of infirmity, *cap.* 9. *num.* 39.
His Wanton and laſciuious ſpeaches, *Ibid. num.* 60.
His abuſe of *Doctor Geneſius Sepulueda*, *cap.* 9. *num.* 57.
His *Couentry-caſe* about the plague. *cap.* 10. *nu.* 31.
His egregious impudency and abuſe of authors therin. *Ib. nu.* 32. & 33.
His lying Metropolis, *Ib. n.* 33.
His booke againſt Equiuocatiõ examined and anſvvered, *cap.* 11. *per*

11. *per totum.*
Hovv he impugneth himſelfe, *Ibidem. num.* 13.
His abuſing of *Azor*, *cap.* 11. *n.* 18. & 19.
His Punica fides about falſification, *cap.* 11. *nu.* 36.
His egregious Coſenage, *Ibid. num.* 38.
His abſurd ſyllogiſmes, cap. 11. *num.* 50.
His Apoſtolical defenſe againſt lying, *cap.* 11. *num.* 61. & 62.
Truth defined by *S. Auguſtine cap.* 8. *nu.* 40. Three ſortes or degrees therof. *Ibid. nu.* 41.
Tumultes againſt lawful Princes practized by Proteſtantes, *cap.* 1. *num.* 13. 14. 15. & *de inceps.*
Tumultes in Scotland, *cap.* 1. *n.* 20. 21. 22. 23. & 24.
Tyranny and *Tyrantes* of tvvo ſortes, *cap.* 5. *nu.* 47.

V

VALENTIA the Ieſuite his Charge againſt Caluin for Arrianiſme, *cap.* 6. *n.* 78.
His authority for the lavvfulnes of Equiuocation, *c.* 10. *n.* 16.
Vanity of Thomas Mortons vaunt of Truth, *cap.* 6. *n.* 2.
Vaſquez his diſcours about pertinacy, *cap.* 6. *n.* 43.
Venetians their diſagreement vvith Pope *Paulus Quintus*, *cap.* 5. *num.* 41.
Vncertainty in Proteſtantes doctrine, *Cap.* 5. *nu.* 46.
Vſe of Equiuocation receyued by Cath. Doctors for 400. yeares, *cap.* 7. *nu.* 8.

VV

VVHITTINGHAM deane of *Durham* his doctrine, *cap.* 4. *num.* 35.
D. VVhitaker his abſurd anſvvere to Doctor Sanders, about the authority of Ancient Fathers, *cap.* 12. *num.* 26.
VViat his practice and conſpiracy againſt Q. Mary of England, *cap.* 4. *nu.* 35.
M. VVilliam Reynoldes his booke of *Caluino-Turciſmus*, *c.* 2. *n.* 6.
His collection of moderne hereſyes, *Ibid. num.* 8.
Abuſed by Tho. Morton, *Ibid. num.* 27.
VVitneſſes hovv, and vvhen they are obliged to ſpeake the truth, *cap.* 10. *nu.* 25. & 26.

Y

YESTVVERT the Printer his falſification in printing the Charter of *K. Kenulphus*, *cap.* 12. *nu.* 88.

Z

ZVINGLIVS the chiefe ſtyrrer of Rebellion in the *Cantons of Zuitzerland*, *c.* 1. *num.* 14. Slaine. *Ibid.*
Zuinglianiſme impugned by *Luther*, *cap.* 2. *nu.* 15. & 16.

FINIS.

